

# Changing alignments in the Greek of southern Italy

*Adam Ledgeway*  
University of Cambridge  
*anl21@cam.ac.uk*

*Norma Schifano*  
University of Birmingham  
*N.Schifano@bham.ac.uk*

*Giuseppina Silvestri*  
University of California, Los Angeles  
*g.silvestri@ucla.edu*

## Abstract

This article investigates a peculiar pattern of subject case-marking in the Greek of southern Italy. Recent fieldwork with native speakers, coupled with the consultation of some written sources, reveals that, alongside prototypical nominative subjects, Italo-Greek also licenses accusative subjects, despite displaying a predominantly nominative-accusative alignment. Far from being random replacements within a highly attrited grammar, the distribution of these accusative subjects obeys specific structural principles, revealing similarities with historical attestations of the so-called ‘extended accusative’ in early Indo-European. On the basis of these data, Italo-Greek is argued to be undergoing a progressive shift towards an active-stative alignment, a claim supported by additional evidence from auxiliary selection, adverb agreement and sentential word order.

## Keywords

Greko – Griko – extended accusative – subjects – active-stative alignment

## 1 Introduction

Greek has been spoken as an indigenous language in southern Italy since ancient times (Falcone 1973:12-38; Horrocks 1997:304-306; Manolassou 2005:112-21; Ralli 2006:133). According to one, albeit now unpopular, view championed most notably by Rohlfs (1924; 1933; 1974; 1977), the Greek spoken in southern Italy, henceforth Italo-Greek, is to be considered a direct descendant of the ancient (mainly Doric) Greek varieties which were imported into *Magna Graecia* as early as the eighth century B.C.E. with the establishment of numerous Greek colonies along the coasts of southern Italy. The opposing – and now widely accepted – view, argued most vehemently by Battisti (1924; cf. also Morosi, 1870; Parlangèli, 1953), sees the Greek of southern Italy as a more recent import dating from the Byzantine period of domination between the sixth and eleventh centuries. However, as argued by Fanciullo (1996; 2001; 2007), these two apparently opposing views can be reconciled if we accept that Italo-Greek is largely a Byzantine import preserving some ancient Doric features, a view further supported by Ralli (2006:134) who argues that ‘[Italo-Greek] preserves some traces of an ancient Doric substratum, which could point to the continuous uninterrupted presence of Greek speakers in South Italy’ (cf. also Squillaci 2017:7-9; Ralli in press). Whatever the correct view, it is clear that by

the beginning of the second millennium C.E. Greek was still widely spoken as a native language in north-western Sicily, Calabria and Apulia. Indeed, as late as the fourteenth century Petrarch is reported to have advised those wishing to study Greek to go to Calabria.

Today, by contrast, Italo-Greek survives precariously only in a handful of villages of southern Calabria and Salento in the respective areas of Bovesia and Grecia Salentina (cf. Schifano and Silvestri 2017). In Bovesia, where the local variety of Greek is known as *Greko*, the language is today confined to five remote villages of the Aspromonte mountains (namely, Bova (Marina), Chorio di Rochudi, Condofuri (Marina), Galliciano and Roghudi (Nuovo)),<sup>1</sup> where it is reputed, according to some of the most generous estimates (cf. Katsoyannou 1995: 27-31; 2001:8-9), to be spoken by around 500 speakers (see also Spano 1965; Martino 1980:308-313; Stamuli 2007:16-19; Remberger 2011:126f.; 2018:138f.; Squillaci 2017:14f.). In Grecia Salentina, on the other hand, the language, locally known as *Griko*, has fared somewhat better, in that it continues to be spoken in a pocket of eight villages of the Otranto peninsula (Calimera, Castrignano de' Greci, Corigliano d'Otranto, Martano, Martignano, Soleto,<sup>2</sup> Sternatia, Zollino) by as many as 20,000 speakers according to the most optimistic estimates (Comi 1989; Sobrero and Miglietta 2005; Manollessou 2005:105; Marra 2008:52f.; Romano 2008).

In what follows we shall focus on one feature of the syntax of Italo-Greek which has to date gone unnoticed in the literature and which we believe is otherwise unattested in other modern dialects and varieties of Greek outside of Italy.<sup>3</sup> The phenomenon in question concerns the possibility of marking a subset of surface subjects with accusative case.<sup>4</sup> A careful analysis of such attestations reveals that accusative-marked subjects cannot be disregarded as random replacements within a highly attrited grammar but, rather, obey regular structural principles that underlie an ongoing progressive shift towards an active-stative syntactic alignment. It is our contention that this change in the alignment of Italo-Greek is the result of contact with Romance where reflexes of an active-stative alignment are otherwise abundantly attested.

The article is organized as follows. After providing a brief introduction to some basic concepts in the general description of morphosyntactic alignments (§2), we briefly consider the distribution of case-marking and formal splits in the verb system of Standard Modern Greek (§3) and their differing characterizations in terms of alignment. This is followed by an examination of the fundamental properties and distribution of the so-called 'extended accusative' in early Indo-European (§4), which we subsequently compare with the distribution of accusative subjects in the Italo-Greek varieties of Griko (§5.1) and Greko (§5.2) which are shown to follow an emerging active-stative alignment. In support of this analysis, the following sections (§§6.1-3) review further evidence from Italo-Greek for the emergence of morphosyntactic reflexes of an active-stative alignment. The final section (§7) summarizes the results and offers some general conclusions and remarks about the nature and role of Romance-Greek contact in shaping the grammars of Italo-Greek in southern Italy.

## 2 Alignments: some preliminary observations

<sup>1</sup> To these villages one can also add the small diaspora of speakers now dispersed across Melito di Porto Salvo and across the city of Reggio Calabria (e.g. in the district of San Giorgio Extra) following the forced evacuations of their villages following natural disasters such as landslides and earthquakes.

<sup>2</sup> Griko is widely reported to have been abandoned in the village of Soleto during the second half of the previous century (Rohlf 1977:69; Sobrero 1980:399; Aprile et al. 2002:680; see also Pellegrino 2016:141, fn.3). However, during our fieldwork in 2016, we were able to find one speaker from Soleto whose data are reported below.

<sup>3</sup> Instances of accusative subjects in Italo-Greek were already identified by Rohlf (1977:69) and Katsoyannou (1999), who either discarded them as random speech errors and/or incorrectly interpreted them as the consequence of a collapsing morphological case system. For a comparative discussion of non-nominative subjects in non-personal constructions across the Balkans, see Friedman & Joseph (2018).

<sup>4</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all the data reported in this study come from our fieldwork with native speakers *in loco* during 2016.

Before looking at the details of accusative subjects in the Greek of southern Italy, we must first review some basic concepts and distinctions about morphosyntactic alignments which will prove essential in our discussion of Italo-Greek below. Following a widely-accepted typological distinction (Dixon 1994:6-8; see also Comrie 1989:110-116), we can distinguish three core sentential participants labelled A and O (1a), the subject and object, respectively, of a transitive construction, and S (1b-c), the subject of an intransitive construction:

- (1) a. **John** (A) was smoking **a cigarette** (O).  
 b. **John** (S) was smoking.  
 c. **The gun** (S) was smoking.

In a number of areas of their grammars, many languages make a further distinction between two types of intransitive S(subject): (i) an S with an agentive interpretation (1b) and hence, to all intents and purposes, identical to A(gent), bar the presence of an O(bject); and (ii) an S with an UNDERGOER interpretation (1c) and hence, to all intents and purposes, identical to O(bject), bar the presence of an A(gent). The former we may call  $S_A$  and the latter  $S_O$ .

To varying degrees, languages make available the means to encode these three core participants through nominal marking systems (case, adpositions), verb marking systems (agreement, auxiliaries, voice distinctions), and through sentential word order. Together these three mechanisms of argument marking variously place the three nuclear sentential participants into one of the following three typological organizations (cf. La Fauci 1997:12; Ledgeway 2012:ch. 7):

- (2) a. A is formally distinguished from O and, in turn, shares the same formal marking as  $S_{A/O}$ ;  
 b. O is formally distinguished from A, and, in turn, shares the same formal marking as  $S_{A/O}$ ;  
 c. A is formally distinguished from O, but the formal marking of S is split between A (=  $S_A$ ) and O (=  $S_O$ );

The arrangement described in (2a) is traditionally termed a nominative-accusative alignment, while the arrangement described in (2b) yields an ergative-absolutive alignment. The third and final active-/stative alignment in (2c) represents a compromise between the two preceding alignments, in that S is formally aligned in part with A and in part with O. It is doubtful, however, that the full grammatical apparatus of any language can be consistently described in terms of just one of these three alignments, although it is often possible to associate particular languages with one predominant orientation. For example, below we shall see that Italo-Greek combines an inherited nominative-accusative orientation with an emerging active-stative orientation in certain areas of the nominal and verbal systems, as well as at the level of the sentence where we shall review evidence for an active-stative orientation in the patterns of sentential word order.

### 3 Standard Modern Greek

The nominal system of Standard Modern Greek can unequivocally be described in terms of a nominative-accusative alignment. By way of illustration, consider the three sentences in (3a-c):

- (3) a. **O** **Janis** **diavazi** **tin**  
 the.MSG.NOM Janis.MSG.NOM read.ACT.IPFV.NON-PST.3SG the.FSG.ACC  
 efimerida. (SMG)  
 newspaper.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Janis reads the newspaper.’
- b. **O** **Janis** **diavazi.** (SMG)  
 the.MSG.NOM Janis.MSG.NOM read.ACT.IPFV.NON-PST.3SG  
 ‘Janis reads.’
- c. **Petheni** **o** **Janis.** (SMG)  
 die.ACT.IPFV.NON-PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM Janis.NOM.MSG  
 ‘Janis is dying.’

Whether the grammatical subject corresponds to the A of a transitive predicate (3a), the S<sub>A</sub> of an (intransitive) unergative predicate (3b), or the S<sub>O</sub> of an (intransitive) unaccusative predicate (3c), it invariably surfaces in the nominative. This is indicated by the nominative, masculine singular definite article *o* and the final inflexion *-s* borne by the nominal *Jani-* in the examples above. By contrast, the grammatical O(bject) of a transitive verb surfaces in the accusative form marked in (3a) above by the distinctive accusative form of the feminine singular definite article *tin* (cf. nominative form *i*). It follows that the nominal system of Standard Modern Greek formally contrasts A and S<sub>(A/O)</sub> (marked nominative) with O (marked accusative) to yield a canonical nominative-accusative orientation which proves totally insensitive to the semantic characterization (AGENT vs UNDERGOER) of the subject.

By contrast, the verb system is less consistent in its morphosyntactic orientation. As the examples in (3a-c) already clearly illustrate, in the active voice the verb system also operates according to a nominative-accusative alignment, in that the finite verb invariably agrees in person and number with the nominative subject (witness the final 3SG inflexion *-i* in all three examples above), and not with the accusative object when present. However, Greek also presents a medio-passive voice, which formally brings together intransitive UNDERGOER subjects variously drawn from the passive (4a) and unaccusative structures including some deponents, anticausatives, inherent reflexives and reflexive constructions (4b), which all share a distinct set of non-active morphological forms (cf. final 3SG inflexion in *-te*):

- (4) a. **I** **efimerida** **diavazete**  
 the.FSG.NOM newspaper.FSG.NOM-ACC read.NON-ACT.IPFV.NON-PST. 3SG  
 apo ton Jani. (SMG)  
 from the.MSG.ACC Janis.MSG.ACC  
 ‘The newspaper is being read by Janis.’
- b. **Erkete** **o** **Janis.** (SMG)  
 come.NON-ACT.IPFV.NON-PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM Janis.MSG.NOM  
 ‘Janis is coming.’

As the active-passive contrast between (3a) and (4a) reveals, the surface passive subject in the latter is underlyingly an O, hence its S<sub>O</sub> status. Analogously, the overwhelming majority of non-passive middles are unaccusative predicates (cf. 4b), whose surface subject is analysed in many current formal frameworks as a derived subject moved from or related to the verb’s complement position, hence its UNDERGOER interpretation and S<sub>O</sub> status. We thus see that Standard Modern Greek

combines a nominative-accusative formal distinction in the nominal system, inasmuch as all surface subjects (be they A, S<sub>A</sub> or S<sub>O</sub>) are systematically marked nominative, with a mixed alignment in the verb system: syntactically the person and number agreement of the finite verb is invariably controlled by a nominative-marked argument in accordance with a nominative-accusative alignment, but, morphologically, the finite verb predominantly displays an active-stative alignment with distinct morphological paradigms for verbs with active subjects (A/S<sub>A</sub>) on the one hand and stative subjects (S<sub>O</sub>) on the other (cf. 3SG *-i* vs *-te* in (3) vs (4) above).<sup>5</sup>

#### 4 Extended accusative in early Indo-European

The label ‘extended accusative’ is traditionally used to refer to the extension of accusative case to mark the subjects of a subclass of (intransitive) verbs, a phenomenon commonly attested in many ancient Indo-European languages (Moravcsik 1978; Plank 1985) including, among others, Avestan (Lazzeroni 2002:311-313; Danesi 2014), old Persian (Kent 1946), Gothic (Delbrück 1900), early Germanic (Barðdal (2011), Ancient Greek (Lazzeroni 2013) and Latin.<sup>6</sup> In some cases such attestations have been dismissed as cases of textual corruption, morphological conflation or anacolutha (Ledgeway 2012:329; Adams 2013:ch. XII, §6.3). Although there is no doubt some truth to some of these claims in a small number of cases, overall their number is too great and their structural distribution too regular for them to be dismissed as such. The question therefore arises as to whether those attestations which are recognised as genuine outputs of the grammars under investigation should be analysed as constructions simply inherited from a common proto-stage of Indo-European, or as independent developments that arose in individual members of the family (see, for example, Danesi 2014).<sup>7</sup> For the sake of the present discussion, it will suffice to observe that, despite individual differences, the distribution of the extended accusative shares some common features across early Indo-European. These include: (i) the greater frequency of the extended accusative in lower-register texts; (ii) the optionality of the extended accusative, insofar as it continues to occur alongside nominative subjects in the same contexts; and (iii) the class of subjects involved, which is generally limited to inactive or involuntary intransitive subjects that exert minimal or no control over the relevant event or situation (Moravcsik 1978:254; Plank 1985). Only rarely and in later chronological periods is the extended accusative found with dynamic intransitive subjects and, even much more rarely, with transitive agentive subjects.<sup>8</sup>

The syntactic and semantic criteria governing the extension of accusative-marking to subjects cross-linguistically are summarized in Table 1:

Table 1. Extension of accusative: syntactic and semantic criteria<sup>9</sup>

Syntactic criterion	
unaccusatives → unergatives → transitives	
S <sub>O</sub>	S <sub>A</sub>

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Mackridge (1987:96-99), Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2004), Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton (2004:ch. 6).

<sup>6</sup> Regarding the distribution of the extended accusative in Latin, see Löfstedt (1933:329-334), Norberg (1944:21-32), Gerola (1949-50), Bastardas Parera (1953:16-20), Westerbergh (1956:235f.), Herman (1966; 1987:102; 1995:72-75), Durante (1981:41), Pensado (1986), Väänänen (1982:203f.), Helltula (1987), La Fauci (1988:54f.; 1997), Zamboni (1998:131f.), Pieroni (1999), Cennamo (2001a; 2001b; 2009; 2011), Lazzeroni (2002:310-312), Rovai (2005; 2007; 2012; 2014); Ledgeway (2011a:459-461); Adams (2013:ch. XII, §6.3); Bentley (2016:821f.).

<sup>7</sup> On the issue of the origins of other instances of non-nominative subjects in non-personal constructions across the Balkans, see also Friedman & Joseph (2018).

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, Plank (1985:290), Rovai (2005:62f.), Cennamo (2009:324-326) and Ledgeway (2012:331) on Latin. Cf., however, also Adams (2013:247-249).

<sup>9</sup> See Cennamo (2009:341) for a third pragmatic criterion, namely accusative extension to constituents originally denoting the topic.

---

**Semantic criterion**


---



---

inactive inanimate → active inanimate → active animate

---

A good case in point is represented by (late) Latin, where the extended accusative is mainly attested in low transitivity domains in the sense of Hopper and Thompson (1980:252; cf. also Sorace 2000; Rovai 2005:63), in that the appearance of the accusative reflects the underlying semantic case of the UNDERGOER subject formally aligning it with the class of O(bjects).<sup>10</sup> It therefore typically surfaces with S<sub>0</sub>-type subjects in middle constructions with deponents (5a), anticausatives (5b), passives (5c), impersonal passives (5d), and existentials (5e), as well as in active syntax in conjunction with unaccusatives (5f) and, in particular, the verb ESSE ‘be’ (5g).

- (5) a. nascitur ei genuorum **contractionem**  
 born.PASS.PRS.IND.3SG him.MSG.DAT knees.NPL.GEN contraction.FSG.ACC  
 aut **claudicationem** (Lat., *Mul. Ch.* 516)  
 or limp.FSG.ACC  
 ‘his knees are developing a contraction or a limp’
- b. **multos languores** sanantur in ipsis  
 many.MPL.ACC weaknesses.MPL.ACC heal.PASS.PRS.IND.3PL in same.PL.ABL  
 locis (Lat., *Ant. Plac. Itin.* 165.16)  
 places.MPL.ABL  
 ‘many weaknesses are healed in these places’
- c. **ipsas portas** aperiuntur (Lat., *Itin. Hier.* 11.1)  
 sames.FPL.ACC gates.FPL.ACC open.PASS.PRS.IND.3PL  
 ‘the(se) gates are opened’
- d. et sic fit **orationem** pro omnibus (Lat., *Per. Aeth.* 25.3)  
 and thus to.be.done.PRS.IND.3SG prayer.FSG.ACC for all.NPL.ABL  
 ‘and thus the prayer is made for everyone’
- e. habebat de ciuitate forsitan **mille**  
 have.IPFV.PST.IND.3SG from city.FSG.ABL perhaps thousand  
**quingentos passus** (Lat., *Per. Aeth.* 23.2)  
 five.hundred.MPL.ACC steps.M.ACC  
 ‘it was perhaps 1500 paces from the city’
- f. ut **sanguinem** exeat **copiosum** (Lat., *Mul. Ch.* 618)  
 so.that blood.MSG.ACC exit.PRS.SBJV.3SG copious.MSG.ACC  
 ‘so that plentiful amounts of blood may run out’
- g. si sine uulnere erit, **totam curationem**  
 if without wound.NSG.ABL be.FUT.IND.3SG all.FSG.ACC healing.FSG.ACC  
 haec est (Lat., *Mul. Ch.* 526)

<sup>10</sup> See Lazzeroni (2002:310-312), Cennamo (2009; 2011), Ledgeway (2012:328ff), Bentley (2016:822). Cf. also Danesi (2014) for similar contexts in Avestan.

this.FSG.NOM be.PRS.IND.3SG

‘if he is unwounded, this is all part of the healing process’

Cross-linguistically, instances of the extended accusative also tend to occur in varieties whose case systems are undergoing considerable weakening, a feature also readily observable in late Latin (but cf. old Persian, Danesi 2014:251, fn.70). Arguably, this ‘extended’ use of the accusative which increases greatly in frequency in later Latin texts can be construed as a gradual alignment shift in the nominal system, whereby non-active subjects come increasingly to be formally marked on a par with transitive objects. In particular, nominative is reserved for A/S<sub>A</sub> subjects and accusative for O(bjects) and S<sub>O</sub> subjects in accordance with an emerging active-stative alignment and, more rarely in later periods, also for S<sub>A</sub> subjects in accordance with an ergative-absolutive alignment (La Fauci 1997:57ff; Zamboni 1998:131ff; Ledgeway 2012:332; Bentley 2016:822).

## 5 Extended accusative in Italo-Greek

### 5.1 A note on case-marking in Italo-Greek

Just like Standard Modern Greek, Italo-Greek determiners and nominals show morphological case-marking for nominative, accusative and genitive-dative across three genders (masculine, feminine, neuter) and two numbers (singular vs plural). However, the morphophonological reduction of several of its nominal inflexional markers has led to many instances of apparent syncretism. Although in some cases there arise genuine instances of neutralization, in most cases the apparent syncretisms are crucially resolved by means of an additional phonosyntactic strategy whereby, following an original sandhi assimilation, an erstwhile final inflexional consonant today surfaces in the consonantal lengthening of the initial consonant of the following word. For example, when preceded by the definite article (cf. Table 2), the nominative vs accusative distinction in masculine and feminine nouns in Griko may be marked by lengthening of their initial consonant (e.g. *(t)on liko* ‘the.MSG.ACC wolf.MSG.NOM-ACC’ > *(t)o liko* ‘the.MSG.ACC wolf.MSG.ACC’ vs *o liko* ‘the.MSG.NOM wolf.MSG.NOM’), a phenomenon for which we borrow the Romance label *raddoppiamento fonosintattico* ‘phonosyntactic doubling’ (henceforth RF).<sup>11</sup>

Table 2. Griko definite articles

	Masculine		Feminine	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nom	o	i, e	i, e <sup>12</sup>	i, e
Acc	(t)on + V / some C <sup>13</sup> to <sup>+RF</sup> o <sup>+RF</sup>	tos, (t)us tu <sup>+RF</sup> u <sup>+RF</sup>	(t)in + V / some C ti <sup>(+RF)</sup> i <sup>+RF,14</sup>	(t)es + V / some C te <sup>+RF</sup> e <sup>15</sup>

By way of illustration, consider the Griko examples in (6)-(7) where the nominative vs accusative case distinction is marked solely by the absence vs presence of RF, respectively:<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The alternance between *t*-forms and vowel forms in the accusative (e.g. *to* vs *o*) is optional. For a more detailed discussion, see Ledgeway, Schifano and Silvestri (in prep:ch.2). See also Morosi (1870:118ff.) and Rohlfs (1977:66ff.).

<sup>12</sup> The feminine singular and plural form *e* is limited to the Griko spoken in Calimera.

<sup>13</sup> The consonants affected are velars and labials (Morosi 1870:118), although assimilation may also occur, e.g. *tom Petro* ‘the.MSG.ACC Petro.MSG.ACC’ (Rohlfs 1977:181).

<sup>14</sup> RF may be absent in conjunction with the accusative feminine singular only in Calimera, where there is no ambiguity with the nominative (viz. *e*).

<sup>15</sup> Despite appearances, in Calimera this *e* does not give rise to ambiguity with the feminine nominative singular since the nouns are inflexionally distinct, e.g. *e kiante.FPL.ACC* vs *e kianta.FSG.NOM* ‘the plant(s)’.

<sup>16</sup> Examples taken from our fieldwork are transcribed according to the principles outlined in Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri (in prep.:§1.2.1).

- (6) a. **O** **Pietro** ttseri na milisi  
 the.MSG.NOM Pietro.MSG.NOM know.PRS.3SG IRR.PRT speak.SBJV.3SG  
 o Griko. (Calimera)  
 the.NSG Griko.NSG  
 ‘Pietro can speak Griko.’
- b. Ena attà filia mu pu Luppiu teli na  
 one from.the friend.NPL =my from Lecce want.PRS.3SG IRR.PRT  
 di o ssindako. (Calimera)  
 see.SBJV.3SG the.MSG.ACC mayor.MSG.ACC  
 ‘One of my friends from Lecce wants to meet the mayor.’
- (7) a. Motte èstasa essu mu, i **Maria**  
 when arrive.PFV.PST.1SG at.home =my the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM  
 ikhe fanta.<sup>17</sup> (Sternatia)  
 have.PASS.IPFV.3SG eat.NON-FIN  
 ‘When I arrived home, Maria had eaten.’
- b. Ida i **Mmaria** defore atti  
 see.PFV.PST.1SG the.FSG.ACC Maria.FSG.ACC outside from.the  
 porteddha keccia tis aglisia.<sup>18</sup> (Calimera)  
 door.FSG.NOM-ACC small.FSG.NOM-ACC the.FSG.GEN church.FSG.NOM-ACC-GEN  
 ‘I saw Maria outside the little door of the church.’

As we shall see, it is precisely the presence or otherwise of RF that will allow us in many cases to discriminate between nominative and accusative marking on many of the subjects discussed below.

## 5.2 Accusative subjects in Griko

On a par with Standard Modern Greek (cf. §3), Griko apparently presents a core nominative-accusative alignment, formally contrasting subjects and objects. Thus, we see in (8) that subjects of transitives (A; 8a), unergatives (S<sub>A</sub>; 8b) and unaccusatives (S<sub>O</sub>; 8c) are treated uniformly in that they are all marked nominative, in contrast to transitive O(bject)s which are systematically marked accusative (cf. *us piattu* in 8a):

- (8) a. **E** **Maria** pleni kalà **us**  
 the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM wash.PRS.3SG well the.MPL.ACC  
 piattu. (Calimera)

<sup>17</sup> Given their historical evolution (Manolessou 2005b), in the literature (Italo-)Greek verb forms in *-onta/-onda* such as *fanta* ‘eaten, eating’ have been variously referred to as participles (e.g. Rohlfs 1977:109f., 200f.; Mackridge 1985; Manolessou 2005a) and gerunds (e.g. Katsoyannou 1995; Holton et al. 2012). Without taking a firm position, for ease of exposition here we simply gloss them as NON-FIN. The same gloss is applied to non-finite forms in *-meno/-a*.

<sup>18</sup> Non-proparoxytone feminine singular nouns ending in *-a* are always formally ambiguous between nominative, accusative and genitive (unless marked accusative through RF). In what follows we shall gloss them as NOM-ACC-GEN only when the context clarifies that the noun is genitive. In contexts where the noun may only be either nominative or accusative, the formal ambiguity with genitive will not be indicated.



dishes.MPL.ACC

‘Maria washes the dishes well.’

- b. **O**                      **Pietro**                      kantali                      fiakka. (Calimera)  
 the.MSG.NOM    Pietro.MSG.NOM    sing.PRS.3SG    badly  
 ‘Pietro sings badly.’

- c. Ekhi                      tossu                      khronu                      ka                      e  
 have.PRS.3SG    many.MPL.ACC    years.MPL.ACC    that                      the.FSG.NOM

aglisia                      èpese. (Calimera)

church.FSG.NOM-ACC    fall.PFV.PST.3SG

‘It’s been many years since the church fell.’

However, alongside such prototypically marked arguments, viz. nominative subjects and accusative objects, our corpus also includes attestations of subjects marked with accusative case.<sup>19</sup> These were produced by both proficient (p.) and semi-speakers (s-s.) from all eight villages and belong to the spoken informal register of the language.<sup>20</sup> As for their syntactic distribution, they can occur in root (9), embedded (10) and adverbial (11) clauses, and both in pre- and postverbal positions (cf. 9a vs 9b):<sup>21</sup>

- (9) a. **O**                      **ppatera**                      ibbie                      vòtonta                      spiti  
 the.MSG.ACC    priest.MSG.ACC    go.IPFV.PST.3SG    go.around.NON-FIN    house.NSG

spiti.<sup>22</sup> (Martano, p.)

house.NSG

‘The priest used to go around visiting all the houses.’

- b. Ipao                      na                      piao                      ta                      treffia                      mu                      na  
 go.PRS.1SG    IRR.PRT    take.SBJV.1SG    the.NPL    brothers.NPL    =my    IRR.PRT

tos                      po                      possen                      apètane                      **to**  
 them.DAT=    say.SBJV.1SG    how    die.PFV.PST.3SG    the.MSG.ACC

sciddho. (Sternatia, p.)

dog.MSG.NOM-ACC

‘I’ll go and fetch my brothers to tell them how their dog died.’

<sup>19</sup> Neuter subjects are not taken into account here as nominative and accusative are syncretic in the neuter gender; indeed in glossing neuter forms below we do not indicate case, unless genitive. Note, furthermore, that we do not distinguish in what follows between (abstract) Case and (morphological) case, but simply use the spelling ‘case’ throughout.

<sup>20</sup> By semi-speaker, we mean speakers belonging to one of the following three subcategories: (i) L1 speakers whose once full competence has been eroded as a consequence of a lack of use of the language for a more or less extended period of time; (ii) L1 speakers who have naturally acquired Griko from their families, but only partially; and (iii) local L2 speakers who have decided to learn Griko later in life, but who have never reached full native-like competence (Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri 2018a:13); see also Dorian (1980; 1981) and, for Italo-Greek, Stamuli (2007:65-67) and Guardiano & Stavrou (2019:5-6).

<sup>21</sup> A different type of accusative subject is also found in a subset of embedded clauses, for which see Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri (2018c).

<sup>22</sup> Note that in examples such as (9a) we gloss (and place in bold) the masculine singular article *o* as distinctively accusative, and not as ambiguously nominative-accusative (cf. nominative *o* vs accusative (*to*)(*n*)), since it produces RF on the following nominal. Clearly, what is relevant in such examples is the determiner’s ability to license RF and not just its surface form.

- c. **Ti**                      **kkiatera**                      tu                      Petru                      iffie.  
          the.FSG.ACC      daughter.FSG.ACC      the.MSG.GEN      Petro.MSG.GEN      run.PFV.PST.3SG

(Corigliano, s-s.)

‘Petro’s daughter ran away.’

- d. **Tes**                      kiante                      tus                      pomudoru  
          the.FPL.ACC      plants.FPL.NOM-ACC      the.MPL.GEN      tomato.MSG.GEN

ikàisa. (Corigliano, s-s.)

burn.PFV.PST.3PL

‘The tomato plants burnt.’

- (10) Mu                      fènato                      ka                      ‘tto                      pornò  
          me.DAT=      seem.NON-ACT.IPFV.PST.3SG      that      at.the.NSG      morning.NSG

**i**                      **Mmaria**                      epplinite  
          the.FSG.ACC      Maria.FSG.ACC      NEG=clean.NON-ACT.IPFV.PST.3SG

kalà.<sup>23</sup> (Corigliano, s-s.)

well

‘It seemed to me that Maria didn’t used wash properly in the morning.’

- (11) Motte      **to**                      **Ppetro**                      ce      **ti**                      **Rrita**  
          when      the.MSG.ACC      Petro.MSG.ACC      and      the.FSG.ACC      Rita.FSG.ACC
- estàsane                      essu,                      ipane                      na                      pane                      ison  
          arrive.PFV.PST.3PL      at.home      tell.PFV.PST.3PL      IRR.PRT      go.SBJV.3PL      to.the

ospitali. (Corigliano, s-s.)

hospital.MSG.ACC

‘When Pietro and Rita arrived home, they were told to go to the hospital.’

Given the highly attrited status of the language now spoken in a rapidly-shrinking speech community which is today in constant contact with the dominant neighbouring Romance varieties that lack a formal case system (viz. Salentino and (regional) Italian),<sup>24</sup> it is tempting to disregard examples such as (9)-(11) as random replacements produced by speakers whose competence has been drastically eroded (Rohlf 1977:69; cf. also Rossi Taibbi & Carcausi 1959:LIIIf., LIX and Katsoyannou 1999 for Greko). However, a careful investigation of the syntactic distribution of accusative subjects in our corpus reveals a number of interesting affinities with historical attestations of the so-called extended accusative, suggesting that they should be interpreted as the authentic output of a changing grammar rather than performance errors of an increasingly less native grammar.

Indeed, overall instances of accusative subjects in our corpus of Griko are less controversial than many attestations from early Indo-European languages reviewed above, inasmuch as they have been systematically produced by native speakers who have also confirmed their grammaticality. Moreover,

<sup>23</sup> In this and similar examples produced by semi-speakers it is not uncommon to find surface irregularities in all domains, such as *epplinite* instead of *epplènato*.

<sup>24</sup> All Griko speakers are bilingual and the speech community, although recently reported by some to include as many as 20,000 speakers, is undoubtedly considerably smaller (Comi 1989; Sobrero & Miglietta 2005; Manolessou 2005:105; Marra 2008:52f.; Romano 2008).

they share a number of common features with the historical instances of extended accusative reviewed above. First, Griko accusative subjects are also optional: for all the examples including an accusative subject there are speakers who produced the same sentences with a regular nominative subject (12a-b). At the same time, speakers who produced accusative subjects also produced regular nominative subjects, both in the (near-)identical sentences (13)-(15) and in different ones (16)-(17).

- (12) a. Avri            **o**                            **Giorgio**                            enna    pai  
tomorrow    the.MSG.NOM    Giorgio.MSG.NOM    must    go.SBJV.3SG
- ssi                            Ggina. (Sternatia, p.)  
to.the.FSG.ACC    Gina.FSG.ACC
- b. Avri            **to**                            Iorgi                            enna    pai  
tomorrow    the.MSG.ACC    Iorgi.MSG.NOM-ACC    must    go.SBJV.3SG
- ssi                            Ggina. (Soletto, p.)  
to.the.FSG.ACC    Gina.FSG.ACC  
'Tomorrow Giorgio has to go to Gina's.'
- (13) a. O                            ijo                            mbiche. (Sternatia, p.)  
the.MSG.NOM    sun.MSG.NOM-ACC    set.PFV.PST.3SG
- b. **Ton**                            ijo                            mbiche. (Sternatia, same speaker)  
the.MSG.ACC    sun.MSG.NOM-ACC    set.PFV.PST.3SG  
'The sun set.'
- (14) a. **I**                            **antròpi**                            ipane                            is                            kampagna,  
the.MPL.NOM    men.MPL.NOM    go.PRS.3PL    to.the    field.FSG.NOM-ACC
- i**                            jineke                            istène                            essu. (Corigliano, p.)  
the.FPL.NOM    women.FPL.NOM-ACC    stay.PRS.3PL    at.home  
'The men go to the fields, the women stay home.'
- b. Imi                            **antròpu**                            ipame                            is                            kampagna,                            esi  
we.NOM    men.MPL.ACC    go.PRS.1PL    to.the    field.FSG.NOM-ACC    you.2PL.NOM
- jineke                            stete                            essu. (Corigliano, same speaker)  
women.FPL.NOM-ACC    stay.PRS.2PL    at.home  
'We men, go to the fields, you women, stay home.'
- (15) a. **O**                            **kossubrino**                            mu                            itàrattse. (Corigliano, s-s.)  
the.MSG.NOM    cousin.MSG.NOM    =my    leave.PFV.PST.3SG  
'My cousin left.'
- b. **Olu**                            **tus**                            attsaderfò                            mmu  
all.MPL.ACC    the.MPL.ACC    cousin.MSG.NOM-ACC    =my
- taràttsane. (Corigliano, same speaker)  
leave.PFV.PST.3PL  
'All my cousins left.'

- (16) a. **O**                      **ciuri**                      mu    en            ittsera                      na  
 the.MSG.NOM    father.MSG.NOM    =my    NEG=    know.PRS.3SG    IRR.PRT  
 vali                      tus                      kiodu                      na                      stiasi                      ti  
 use.SBJV.3SG    the.MPL.ACC    nails.MPL.ACC    IRR.PRT    fix.SBJV.3SG    the.FSG.ACC  
 pporta. (Sternatia, p.)  
 door.FSG.ACC  
 ‘My father didn’t know how to use the nails to fix the door.’
- b. Ekhi                      kappossus    khronu                      ka    i  
 have.PRS.3SG    many                      years.MPL.ACC    that    the.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 aglisia                      antika                      èpese                      motte  
 church.FSG.NOM-ACC    ancient.FSG.NOM-ACC    fall.PFV.PST.3SG    when  
 kame                      to                      tterremoto                      poddhi.<sup>25</sup> (Sternatia, same speaker)  
 do.PFV.PST.3SG    the.MSG.ACC    earthquake.MSG.ACC    much  
 ‘It’s been many years since the church fell when there was a strong earthquake.’
- (17) a. **O**                      **patera**                      ipai                      spiti                      spiti. (Corigliano, s-s.)  
 the.MSG.NOM    priest.MSG.NOM    go.PRS.3SG    house.NSG    house NSG  
 ‘The priest is going to every house.’
- b. **Ti**                      inglisia                      èpese                      ja    na  
 the.FSG.ACC    church.FSG.NOM-ACC    fall.PFV.PST.3SG    for    an.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 terremoto                      dinatò. (Corigliano, same speaker)  
 earthquake.MSG.NOM-ACC    powerful.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘The church fell because of a powerful earthquake.’

Second, although we are dealing with a predominantly spoken code, accusative subjects in Griko appear to belong predominantly to the spoken and most informal registers of the language. This is confirmed by a preliminary investigation of early and contemporary written sources which has brought to light some examples of accusative subjects, nearly all of which are restricted to early written records (cf. Morosi 1870) of originally orally-recounted tales and stories (18) and contemporary informal texts such as those exemplified in (19) taken from a selection of personal testimonies about life in the past published in the local magazine *I Spitta* ({HYPERLINK “<http://www.rizegrike.com/spitta.php>” }):<sup>26</sup>

- (18) a. Eguich’                      ènan                      afse    cinu.<sup>27</sup> (Martano, Morosi 1870:5)  
 go.out.PFV.PST.3SG    one.MSG.ACC    of    them.MPL.ACC  
 ‘One of them [= Roman soldiers] came forward.’
- b. Nifta                      jùrise                      ittin                      emèra.

<sup>25</sup> Note that although *kame* in (16b) is glossed as ‘make’, its actual meaning here is unaccusative ‘happen’.

<sup>26</sup> The translations below are based on the Italian translations provided in the magazine.

<sup>27</sup> Note however that the final *-n* of the masculine singular article *ena(n)* may have also been triggered by the prevocalic phonological context, rather than just being the etymological *-n* of the accusative (cf. Rohlf 1977:68f. on neuter *to(n)* and masculine/neuter *ena(n)*). The same applies to (18b) (but see 20d for the lack of *-n* on the same noun in the nominative). See also footnote 41 below.



Note that optionality extends to written sources too, insomuch as nominative subjects are also regularly attested, witness the following examples, where all the subjects are marked as nominative despite their occurrence with an unaccusative verb (20a-c) and the copula BE (20d):

- (20) a. Motti epèsane                      o                      Cristò. (Martano, Morosi 1870:5)  
 when die.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM Christ.MSG.NOM  
 ‘When Christ died.’
- b. Dè e                      mane                      dè e                      ciuri  
 NEG the.FPL.NOM mothers.FPL.NOM-ACC NEG the.MPL.NOM fathers.MPL.NOM-ACC  
 jurisane. (Martano, Morosi 1870:12)  
 come.back.PFV.PST.3PL  
 ‘Neither the mothers nor the fathers came back.’
- c. Ìrte                      o                      ànemo. (Martano, Morosi 1870:15)  
 come.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM wind.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘The wind came.’
- d. Motti e                      emèra                      en                      afsili.  
 when the.FSG.NOM day.FSG.NOM-ACC be.PRS.3SG high.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 (Martano, Morosi 1870:10)  
 ‘When the day is high.’

Finally, Griko accusative subjects crucially present the same syntactico-semantic restrictions outlined above for the extended accusative in early Indo-European. In particular, the extended accusative targets intransitive subjects which are relatively inactive and inert, in short UNDERGOERS. As a consequence, in our corpus accusative subjects in Griko are principally attested with middle syntax, including deponents with reflexive interpretation (21a; cf. also 10), unaccusatives (21b; cf. also 9a-d, 11, 12b, 13b, 14b, 15b, 16b, 17b, 18a-b), anticausatives (cf. 19b), and the copula BE (21c; cf. also 18c-d).

- (21) a. Mu                      fè nato                      ka ‘tto                      pornò  
 me.DAT= seem.NON-ACT.IPFV.PST.3SG that at.the.NSG morning.NSG  
 i                      Mmaria                      epplinite                      kalà.  
 the.FSG.ACC Maria.FSG.ACC NEG=clean.NON-ACT.IPFV.PST.3SG well  
 (Corigliano, s-s.)  
 ‘It seemed to me that Maria didn’t used wash properly in the morning.’
- b. O                      ppatera                      ibbie                      vòtonta                      spiti  
 the.MSG.ACC priest.MSG.ACC go.IPFV.PST.3SG go.around.NON-FIN house.NSG  
 spiti. (Martano, p.)  
 house.NSG  
 ‘The priest used to go around visiting all the houses.’
- c. Diu mèdeku                      i                      kkali,                      o                      addhu  
 two doctors.MPL.ACC be.PRS.3PL good.MPL.NOM the.MSG.NOM other.MSG.NOM-ACC

e        mmu        piace        poddhi.<sup>28</sup> (Calimera, p.)  
 NEG= me.DAT= like.PRS.3SG much  
 ‘Two doctors are good, as for the other I don’t like him very much.’

To this we can also add low transitivity domains such as example (22) involving a stative predicate with a surface subject characterized by minimal control. Indeed, in accordance with Hopper and Thompson’s (1980:252) interpretation of ‘low transitivity’, we note that example (22) involves just one participant, an A low in potency, and denotes a non-action (viz. state) which is atelic, non-punctual and negated.

(22) **I**                    **Mmaria**                    en        ittsera                    a        ssottsi                    erti  
       the.FSG.ACC   Maria.FSG.ACC   NEG=   know.PRS.3SG   if   can.PRS.3SG   come.INF  
  
 na        fai                    ma        mà. (Calimera, s-s.)  
 IRR.PRT   eat.SBJV.3SG   with=   us.ACC  
 ‘Maria doesn’t know if she can come and eat with us.’

Conversely, the vast majority of animate and/or active subjects with transitive verbs included in our corpus bear the expected nominative marking. The very few instances of accusative marking in these contexts such as (23a) were only produced by semi-speakers (cf. fn. 20). This suggests that such rare examples should be interpreted either as genuine performance errors or as a separate case of reanalysis within a drastically more attrited grammar not shared by proficient native speakers (23b).

(23) a. **Ton**                    aderfò                    mmu        ikhe                    plinonta  
       the.MSG.ACC   brother.MSG.NOM-ACC   =my   have.IPFV.PST.3SG   clean.NON-FIN  
  
 oli    to                    spiti.<sup>29</sup> (Corigliano, s-s.)  
 all    the.NSG   house.NSG  
  
 b. **O**                    aderfò                    mmu        ikhe                    plinonta  
       the.MSG.NOM   brother.MSG.NOM-ACC   =my   have.IPFV.PST.3SG   clean.NON-FIN  
  
 olo        to                    spiti. (Calimera, p.)  
 all.NSG   the.NSG   house.NSG  
 ‘My brother had cleaned the whole house.’

By way of summary, we list below in Table 3 all the classes of verb which are attested in our spoken and written corpus of Griko with an accusative subject:

<sup>28</sup> Interestingly, in this example the referential predicative adjectival complement *kkalì* of the accusative subject (*Diu mèdecu*) is inflected nominative (cf. accusative (*c)cali*), showing a mixed pattern of case-marking. We also find the opposite pattern where the subject surfaces in the nominative and its predicative complement in the accusative, witness the following Greko example from the now defunct variety spoken in Roccaforte:

(i) Egó        addiventégwo        **mian**        gali                    mula. (Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi  
       I.NOM   become.PRS.1SG   a.FSG.ACC   beautiful.FSG.NOM-ACC   mule.FSG.NOM-ACC  
  
 1959:131)  
 ‘I’ll transform into a beautiful mule.’

<sup>29</sup> Note the incorrect inflexion on the quantifier, which should be *olo* as in (23b).

Table 3. All attestations of accusative subject in Griko

Attested verb	Category
break (itself)	Deponents
burn (itself)	
look at oneself	
wash oneself	
close (itself)	
open (itself)	
arrive	Unaccusatives
die	
fall	
go	
leave	
go out	
return	
pass	
run	
go down, set	
happen	
be	Copular BE
stand	
lexical HAVE <sup>30</sup>	Low transitivity contexts
not be able	
not want	
not let	
not know	
buy	Transitives (only s-s.)
cook	
clean	
want	

From the overview in Table 3 it is clear that the extension of the accusative to subjects in Griko follows a regular structural distribution targeting unaccusative syntax according to a pattern analogous in all relevant respects to that observed for early Indo-European (cf. §4). In particular, the extension of the accusative serves to draw a formal distinction on the one hand between S<sub>O</sub> (together with O) marked accusative and A and S<sub>A</sub> marked nominative on the other. We thus see the emergence of a competing active-stative alignment in the nominal domain which, although now well advanced in Griko, has not (yet) replaced the erstwhile nominative-accusative alignment with S<sub>O</sub> subjects still optionally occurring in the nominative. Indeed, in some cases nominative marking is still obligatory today. More specifically, while the extension of the accusative can target nominals which are high in the animacy scale (Silverstein 1976; cf. also Lazzeroni 2002:309; Rovai 2005:64) such as proper nouns and kinship terms, it is never found with pronouns. This undoubtedly reflects the fact that case distinctions are typically most robustly retained with pronouns (Spencer 2009:195), as evidenced by all modern Romance varieties (with the exception of Romanian) where case distinctions have been lost on full DPs but retained to differing degrees in pronouns (Blake 2004:178f.; Sornicola 2011; Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2016:913-916). Revealing in this respect is the example in (14b), repeated here as (24), where we see that the first-person plural subject *imì* occurs in the nominative (cf. accusative (*e*)*mà(s)*), but its accompanying (appositional) nominal modifier *antròpu* (cf. nominative *àntropo*) occurs in the distinctive accusative form.

<sup>30</sup> We include lexical ‘have’ here as it is stative, non-telic and takes a non-Agentive subject (viz. locative).



- (24) *Imì antròpu ipame is kampagna, esi*  
 we men.MPL.ACC go.PRS.1PL to.the field.FSG.NOM-ACC you.NOM.2PL

jineke stete essu. (Corigliano, p.)  
 women.FPL.NOM-ACC stand.PRS.2PL at.home  
 ‘We men go to the fields, you women stay at home.’

### 5.3 *Accusative subjects in Greko*

Having ascertained above the presence of accusative subjects in the Italo-Greek variety of Griko spoken in Salento, it is instructive as a point of comparison to consider now Greko spoken in southern Calabria. The results of our fieldwork in southern Calabria show a situation very similar to that reviewed above for Griko. Indeed, already in an article from (1999), Katsoyannou had noted a small number of instances of accusative subjects in her data from Gallicianò collected in 1984 (cf. also Rossi Taibbi & Carcausi 1959:LIIf., LIX; Rohlfs 1977:69), some examples of which are reported in (25).<sup>31</sup>

- (25) a. *mu po'ni tin tʃi'lia.*  
 me.GEN= hurt.IPFV.N-PST.3SG the.FSG.ACC stomach.FSG.NOM-ACC

(Gallicianò, Katsoyannou 1999)  
 ‘I’ve got stomach ache.’

- b. *'passese ton ke'ro.* (Gallicianò, ibid.)  
 pass.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC time.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘the time passed by.’

- c. *san 'erketo ton 'mina tu*  
 when come.IPFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC month.MSG.ACC the.GEN

*'džuniu.* (Gallicianò, ibid.)  
 June.GEN  
 ‘when the month of June would come around.’

On a par with our previous observations about early Indo-European and Griko, the extension of accusative proves once again optional in Greko, as the following minimal pair produced by the same speaker highlights.

- (26) a. *o po'stino pu eyi'ae s to Vu'ni*  
 the.MSG.NOM postman.NOM who go.PFV.PST.3SG to the Bova

(Gallicianò, Katsoyannou 1999)  
 ‘the postman who went to Bova’

- b. *ton po'stino pu 'epie y Vu'ni*  
 the.MSG.ACC postman.NOM-ACC who go.PFV.PST.3SG to Bova

(Gallicianò, ibid.)

<sup>31</sup> For the sake of the present discussion, it is sufficient to observe that the morpho-phonological shape of definite articles in Greko largely coincides with that of articles in Griko, as outlined in Table 2. The reader is referred to Ledgeway, Schifano and Silvestri (in prep:ch.2) for further details.

‘the postman who used to go to Bova’

Ultimately, Katsoyannou fails to see any regularity in such examples, writing them off as examples of ‘morphological confusion between the nominative and accusative’ (p. 243) brought about by the apparent weakening of the Greko case system. However, even a cursory examination of the examples in (25) and (26b) reveals an inescapable structural regularity to the extension of the accusative in that it invariably targets unaccusative syntax (namely, *So* subjects).<sup>32</sup>

Further substantial confirmation of this emergent active-stative pattern also comes from a consideration of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century written texts. Once again the instances of accusative subjects are quite numerous in collections of originally orally-recounted tales and stories, witness the following examples taken from Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi (1959):

- (27) a. *Će irte* *passéonda éna* *χχristyanò*.<sup>33</sup> (Roccaforte 31)  
 and come.PFV.PST.3SG pass.GER a.MSG.ACC christian.MSG.ACC  
 ‘And a man passed by.’
- b. *Arrívegwe to* *kafè*. (Roccaforte 67)  
 arrive.IPFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC coffee.MSG.ACC  
 ‘The coffee used to arrive.’
- c. *Epasséspai ennéa minu*. (Roccaforte 36)  
 pass.PFV.PST.3PL nine months.MPL.ACC  
 ‘Nine months passed by.’
- d. *Ti efáni ambróndu énan* *aθropúni*. (Bova 480)  
 him.GEN= appear.PST.PFV.3SG in.front a.MSG.ACC man.AUG.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘A large man appeared before him.’
- e. *Anévenne ándom milo énan* *áθropo*.  
 ascend.IPFV.PST.3SG from.the mill.MSG.NOM-ACC a.MSG.ACC man.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 (Bova 403)  
 ‘A man was coming up from the mill.’
- f. *Ecóssu ekáθenne ‘nam* *véččo*. (Bova 481)  
 inside sit.IPFV.PST.3SG a.MSG.ACC old.man.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘There inside was sitting an old man.’
- g. *San etéloe ton* *geró*. (Roghudi 303)  
 when finish.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC time.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘When the time finished.’

As these illustrative examples reveal, accusative subjects consistently occur with core unaccusatives, including verbs of motion and position. However, we also find once again, and indeed more frequently in these late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century texts, nominative subjects in the same contexts, as the following representative unaccusative examples demonstrate.

<sup>32</sup> Significantly, Greko is also reported by Katsoyannou (1999:243f.) to employ the accusative form of nominals in a-syntactic uses (e.g. lists, citation forms), a feature also reported for the extended accusative in late Latin (see Ledgeway 2012:304f.).

<sup>33</sup> Observe the RF effect produced by the masculine singular indefinite article *ena* (< *enan*) in this example.

- (28) a. Irte                                    **mia**                    **máñi**                                    miécéd̥da.  
           come.PVF.PST.3SG    a.FSG.NOM    beautiful.FSG.NOM-ACC    girl.FSG.NOM-ACC

(Roccaforte 49)

‘A beautiful girl came by.’

- b. Ektevi                                    **i**                                    **kammaréra.** (Roccaforte 53)  
       descend.PVF.PST.3SG    the.FSG.NOM    maid.FSG.NOM  
       ‘The maid came down.’

- c. Arrivespe                                    **mia**                    **pálla.** (Roccaforte 76)  
       arrive.PFV.PST.3SG    a.FSG.NOM    ball.FSG.NOM  
       ‘A ball came over.’

- d. Poi    exoristi                                    **o**                                    **liko.** (Roccaforte, 31)  
       then    leave.PFV.PST.3SG    the.MSG.NOM    wolf.MSG.NOM  
       ‘Then the wolf left.’

- e. Efórese                                    **i**                                    **yinéka.** (Roccaforte 62)  
       dress.PFV.PST.3SG    the.FSG.NOM    lady.FSG.NOM  
       ‘The lady got dressed.’

- f. San    ekondóferē                                    **o**                                    arcídyávolō (Bova, 483)  
       when    return.PVF.PST.3SG    the.MSG.NOM    devil.MSG.NOM-ACC  
       ‘When the devil came back’

Consistent with our conclusions so far, we have not found in the corpus of texts in Rossi Taibbi and Caracausi (1959) any examples of accusative subjects outside of core unaccusative syntax. Rather, transitives (29a) and unergatives (29b) exclusively license nominative subjects.<sup>34</sup>

- (29) a. **I**                                    **lukandéra**                                    tos                                    ékame  
           the.FSG.NOM    landlady.FSG.NOM    them.GEN=    make.PFV.PST.3SG  
           to                                    kúnto. (Roccaforte 245)  
           the.MSG.ACC    bill.MSG.NOM-ACC  
           ‘The landlady prepared their bill.’

- b. Arrispúndespe                                    **o**                                    **peniténti.** (Roccaforte 41)  
       reply.PFV.PST.3SG    the.MSG.NOM    penitent.MSG.NOM  
       ‘The penitent replied.’

Unsurprisingly, these same results are confirmed entirely by our own recent fieldwork among Greko speakers who also spontaneously produced accusative subjects exclusively with unaccusative syntax (30a-b), albeit alongside nominative subjects in the same contexts, as the (near) minimal pairs in (31)-(32) produced by the same speakers illustrate:

- (30) a. San    eghíriespa                                    sto                                    Rikhudi, **in**  
           when    come.back.PFV.PST.3SG    to.the    Roghudi    the.FSG.ACC

<sup>34</sup> For one exception in Greko arguably determined by surface word order, see the discussion of example (ii) in footnote 39 below.

anglisia                      ito                      ppèssonda.<sup>35</sup> (Chorio di Roghudi, p.)  
 church.FSG.NOM-ACC   be.IPFV.PST.3SG   fall.GER  
 ‘When I went back to Roghudi, the church had fallen down.’

- b. Ekhi                      tossu                      khronu                      ti                      **tin**  
 have.PRS.3SG   many.MPL.ACC   years.MPL.ACC   that   the.FSG.ACC

anglisia                      èppe. (Roghudi, s-s.)  
 church.FSG.NOM-ACC   fall.PFV.PST.3SG  
 ‘It’s been many years since the church has fallen down.’

- (31) a. Tuto                      ene                      **o**                      **sciddho**  
 this.MSG.NOM-ACC   be.PRS.3SG   the.MSG.NOM   dog.MSG.NOM

dikommu. (Gallicianò, p.)  
 mine  
 ‘This is my dog.’

- b. Tuto                      ene                      **to**                      **ssciddho**                      ddikommu,  
 this.MSG.NOM-ACC   be.PRS.3SG   the.MSG.ACC   dog.MSG.ACC   mine

δεν                      **to**                      ddikossu.<sup>36</sup> (Gallicianò, same speaker)  
 NEG=   the.MSG.ACC   yours  
 ‘This is my dog, not yours.’

- (32) a. Egò                      ce                      **o**                      **Petro**                      δεν                      esòame                      na  
 I.NOM   and   the.MSG.NOM   Pietro.MSG.NOM   NEG=   can.PFV.PST.1PL   IRR.PRT

gràttsome                      poddhè                      grafete. (Bova, p.)  
 write.SBJV.1PL   many.FPL.NOM-ACC   letters.FPL.NOM-ACC

- b. Egò                      ce                      **to**                      **Ppetro**                      δεν                      esòame                      na  
 I.NOM   and   the.MSG.ACC   Pietro.MSG.ACC   NEG=   can.PFV.PST.1PL   IRR.PRT

gràttsome                      poddhè                      grafete. (Bova, same speaker)  
 write.SBJV.1PL   many.FPL.NOM-ACC   letters.FPL.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Pietro and I couldn’t write many letters.’

Particularly interesting are the examples in (32a-b) with coordinated subjects in a context of low transitivity (negated modal): as with the Griko example in (14b, 24), example (32b) shows that accusative-marking of subjects extends to nouns, but not to pronouns which must obligatorily occur in the nominative. Similar evidence can also be found in another corpus of contemporary data (cf. Stamuli 2007), where again accusative subjects are attested with unaccusative verbs (33), the copula BE (34), and with an involuntary subject (cf. ‘the scabies in 35) exerting no control over the event:

- (33) a. 'irte                      **miaŋ**                      yi'neka. (Gallicianò, Stamuli 2007:126)

<sup>35</sup> For final *-n* on the feminine articles in (28a) and (28b), see fn. 27.

<sup>36</sup> In Greko there are two distinct forms for ‘dog’, namely *o sciddho* (m.) and *to sciddhi* (n.) (M.O. Squillaci, p.c.). Although some speakers mix these two forms, this particular informant in (31) consistently uses the masculine form throughout all the interviews, hence the selection of *to* in this example can only be interpreted as accusative marking, as also confirmed by the fact that it licenses RF here.

come.PFV.PST.3SG a.FSG.ACC woman.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘a woman turned up.’

- b. e eka'tevε **tin** o'fia. (Gallicianò, Stamuli 2007:136)  
 and fall.PFV.PST.3SG the.FSG.ACC mountain.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘and the mountain collapsed.’

- c. m:u 'irtε **tə** 'sinaxo.  
 me.GEN-DAT come.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC cold.MSG.NOM-ACC

(Chorio di Roghudi, Stamuli 2007:348)  
 ‘I caught a cold.’

- (34) **tə** kje'rə d:en itə  
 the.MSG.ACC weather.MSG.NOM-ACC NEG is.IPFV.PST.3SG

ka'lo. (Gallicianò, Stamuli 2007:136)  
 good.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘the weather wasn’t good.’

- (35) raspe a ssu trəgi **ti** **rruppa**.  
 scratch.IMP.2SG if you.GEN-DAT eat.PRS.3SG the.FSG.ACC scabies.FSG.ACC

(Gallicianò, Stamuli 2007:552)  
 ‘scratch yourself if the scabies itches you.’

#### 5.4 *Interim conclusions*

In summary, we have observed how within the nominal system the Italo-Greek varieties Griko and Greko present increasing evidence for a progressive shift from a traditional nominative-accusative alignment, in which an extended nominative marks all surface subjects (A, S<sub>A</sub>, S<sub>O</sub>) in contrast to the accusative restricted to marking O(bjects), towards an active-stative alignment in which the accusative is extended beyond O(bject) nominals to now include S<sub>O</sub> subjects thereby restricting nominative-marking to just A and S<sub>A</sub> subjects. However, the emergence of the so-called extended accusative in Italo-Greek represents just one of several surface reflexes of an original Romance active-stative alignment which, in a process of partial replication, has progressively been extended and adapted in the native grammars of Italo-Greek speakers. In the following sections we shall consider some further evidence for this hypothesis from the verbal and sentential domains where other reflexes of a Romance active-stative syntactic alignment have transparently been replicated in the local Greek varieties, confirming that Italo-Greek is undergoing a partial alignment shift.

## 6 Other reflexes of an active-stative alignment

### 6.1 *Auxiliary selection*

Beyond accusative subjects, the effects of an active-stative alignment are also clearly observable in the patterns of perfective auxiliary selection. Historically, all Romance varieties, and still many today (cf. Bentley 2016:824), exhibit an alternation in the selection of the auxiliaries HAVE and BE in conjunction with the past participle in the formation of various compound verb forms.<sup>37</sup> In Italian,

<sup>37</sup> See, among others, Perlmutter (1978), Vincent (1982), Burzio (1986), Loporcaro (2007; 2016), and Ledgeway (2012; 2019).

for example, auxiliary HAVE (= *avere*) is selected in conjunction with transitives/unergatives (36a), whereas unaccusatives (36b), including the passive (36c), select auxiliary BE (= *essere*).

- (36) a. Maria **ha** cucinato (la pasta). (Italian)  
 Maria have.PRS.IND.3SG cook.PFV.PTCP.MSG the.FSG pasta.FSG  
 ‘Maria has been cooking (the pasta).’
- b. **È** arrivata Maria. (Italian)  
 be.PRS.IND.3SG arrive.PFV.PTCP.FSG Maria  
 ‘Maria has arrived.’
- c. **È** **stata** cucinata la pasta. (Italian)  
 be.PRS.IND.3SG be.PFV.PTCP.FSG cook.PFV.PTCP.FSG the.FSG pasta.FSG  
 ‘The pasta has been cooked.’

Griko traditional sources (cf. Rohlfs 1977:198; Gemma Italia & Lambroyorgu 2001:109f.; Tommasi 2001:188; Baldissera 2013:42) report the sole use of auxiliary HAVE in conjunction with the invariable non-finite form in *-onta* (cf. footnote 17 above) for the formation of the pluperfect, regardless of the thematic structure of the lexical verb. Thus, in (37) we witness the systematic use of *íxa* ‘had’ with both the transitive/unergative *gráfsonta* ‘written’ and the unaccusative *értonta* ‘come’.

- (37) a. *íxa* gráfsonta. (Griko, Rohlfs 1977:198)  
 have.IPFV.PST.1SG write.NON-FIN  
 ‘I had written.’
- b. *íxa* értonta. (Griko, Rohlfs 1977:198)  
 have.IPFV.PST.1SG come.NON-FIN  
 ‘I had come.’

Although most of the data in our oral corpus of Griko comply with this picture (cf. 38a-b), some speakers occasionally show signs of an active-stative split of the type exemplified in (36), selecting HAVE with unergative/transitive verbs (39a) and BE with deponent verbs with an UNDERGOER subject (39b) in accordance with an A/S<sub>A</sub> vs S<sub>O</sub> alignment:<sup>38</sup>

- (38) a. Persi o ànemo **ikhe**  
 last.year the.MSG.NOM-ACC wind.MSG.NOM-ACC have.IPVF.PST.3SG  
 klàsonta i pporta. (Calimera, p.)  
 break.NON-FIN the.FSG.ACC door.FSG.ACC  
 ‘Last year the wind had broken the window.’
- b. E Maria **ikhe** skappèttsonta.  
 the.FSG.NOM Maria.FGS.NOM have.IPVF.PST.3SG run.away.NON-FIN  
 (Calimera, p.)  
 ‘Maria had run away.’

- (39) a. Mu ’khe kàmonta poddhì piaciri an

<sup>38</sup> Observe that examples like (39) were produced not only by semi-speakers but also by fluent speakers and as such cannot be disregarded.

me.DAT= have.IPVF.PST.3SG do.NON-FIN much pleasure if  
 a pedia mu **ikha** ssironta olu  
 the.NPL children.NPL =my have.IPVF.PST.3PL win.NON-FIN all.MPL.ACC

tu ssordu. (Calimera, p.)  
 the.MPL.ACC money.MPL.ACC  
 ‘How happy I would have been if my children had won all the money.’

- b. Tis àrtena isi bikkieri siciliani en **isa**  
 the.FSG.GEN-DAT moment these glasses Sicilian NEG= be.IPVF.PST.3PL

klastonta. (Calimera, same speaker)  
 break.NON-FIN  
 ‘Until now these Sicilian glasses hadn’t broken.’

Unsurprisingly, many local Romance dialects of Salento also display a robust active-stative split in auxiliary selection, at least in the present perfect where once again HAVE surfaces with transitives/unergative (40a) and BE with unaccusatives (40b), though not in the pluperfect where most Salentino dialects generalize BE across all verb classes (41).

- (40) a. **Ave** capitu. (Scorrano)  
 have.PRS.IND.3SG understand.PFV.PTCP.MSG  
 ‘He’s understood.’  
 b. **È** sciuta puru quista. (Scorrano)  
 be.PRS.IND.3SG go.PFV.PTCP.FSG also this.one.FSG  
 ‘She’s also gone out.’

- (41) a. Me n’ **era** ditta quarche  
 me= of.it= be.IPFV.PST.3SG say.PFV.PTCP.FSG some  
 tuna. (Scorrano)  
 one.FSG  
 ‘He had told me one or two of them.’  
 b. Forsi **era** statu meju. (Scorrano)  
 perhaps be.IPFV.PST.3SG be.PFV.PTCP.MSG better  
 ‘Perhaps it would have been better.’

Given these facts, it is highly plausible to interpret the novel differential selection of the auxiliaries observed in (39a-b) as part of a larger Romance active-stative alignment which is influencing the morphosyntax of Griko. While it might be objected that in the relevant pluperfect paradigm the local Romance dialects show the generalization of a single auxiliary (cf. 41a-b), and furthermore the opposite auxiliary to that traditionally selected in Griko (cf. 38a-b), the relevance of the more frequent present perfect paradigm (cf. 40a-b) must not be forgotten, nor the influence of (regional) Italian on these Greek speakers, a genuine part of their linguistic repertoire, which, following the pattern in (36a-c), consistently marks the active-stative auxiliary split also in the pluperfect (42).

- (42) a. Maria **aveva** cucinato (la pasta). (Italian)  
 Maria have.IPFV.PST.3SG cook.PFV.PTCP.MSG the.FSG pasta.FSG

‘Maria had been cooking (the pasta).’

- b. **Era**                      arrivata                      Maria. (Italian)  
 be.IPFV.PST.3SG arrive.PFV.PTCP.FSG Maria  
 ‘Maria had arrived.’
- c. Era                      **stata**                      cucinata                      la  
 be.IPFV.PST.3SG be.PFV.PTCP.FSG cook.PFV.PTCP.FSG the.FSG  
 pasta. (Italian)  
 pasta.FSG  
 ‘The pasta had been cooked.’

We note finally that in the Greek of southern Calabria, by contrast, the sole auxiliary consistently employed in the pluperfect is BE (43a), a pattern which is extended to the local Romance dialects of the area (43b) which do not show an active-stative split in the perfective auxiliary (Schifano, Silvestri & Squillaci 2016; Squillaci 2017:§2.7; Remberger 2018). In this domain of the grammar, the overt reflexes of an active-stative alignment are therefore more advanced in Griko than in Greko.

- (43) a. I                      Maria                      **ito**                      tragudionda /  
 the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM-ACC be.IPFV.PST.3SG sing.PTCP  
 erthonda. (Bova)  
 arrive.PTCP  
 ‘Maria had sung/arrived.’
- b. Maria    **era**                      parratu /                      cadutu. (Calabrian, Bova)  
 Maria    be.IPFV.PST.3SG talk.PFV.PTCP.MSG fall.PFV.PTCP.MSG  
 ‘Maria had spoken/fallen.’

## 6.2 *Adverb agreement*

Similar conclusions to those seen for auxiliary selection in the verbal domain can be drawn from the sentential domain in relation to the phenomenon of adverb agreement. As demonstrated in detail in Ledge way (2011b; 2012:ch. 7; 2017) and Ledge way and Silvestri (2016), dialects of southern Italy show a formal syncretism in the categories of adjective and adverb, with adverbial functions systematically expressed by the category of adjective. Yet, in contrast to most languages that conflate the functions of adjective and adverb into a single formal class (cf. Romanian, German) in which the adverb assumes an invariable (e.g., default masculine singular nominative) form, in the dialects of southern Italy the adjective in adverbial function may show overt agreement for gender and/or number. Such agreement is not, however, unconstrained but, rather, follows regular and structurally predictable principles which in most dialects can be formalized in terms of an active-stative split. By way of example, consider the following Romance examples from Salento.

- (44) a. Comu    sai                      asare    **bellu!** (Salento)  
 how    know.PRS.IND.2SG kiss.INF beautiful.MSG  
 ‘What a wonderful kisser you are!’ (female addressee)
- b. **Segretu**                      parlàamu. (Salento)  
 secret.MSG speak.IPFV.PST.1PL  
 ‘We were talking secretly.’



- (45) a. Quannu faci e cose **bone** le  
 when do.PRS.IND.2SG the.FPL things.FPL good.FPL them.FPL=  
 faci a metà.<sup>39</sup> (Salento)  
 do. PRS.IND.2SG at half  
 ‘When you do things well, you don’t finish them off.’
- b. Li cunti me li sacciu fare  
 the.MPL accounts.MPL me= them.MPL= know.PRS.IND.1SG do.INF  
**bueni.** (Salento)  
 good.MPL  
 ‘I can add up well.’
- (46) a. Quiddu spiccia **fiaccu.** (Salento)  
 that.one.MSG finish.PRS.IND.3SG bad.MSG  
 ‘He’ll finish badly (= it doesn’t bode well for him).’
- b. Nu te senti **bbona?** (Salento)  
 NEG= you.2SG= feel.PRS.IND.2SG good.FSG  
 ‘Don’t you feel well?’ (female addressee)’

In the unergative examples in (44), the adjectival adverb invariably occurs in its default masculine singular form irrespective of the number and gender features of the (implied) subject, allowing us to conclude that the  $S_A$  subject is unable to control the agreement features of the adverb. In the respective transitive and unaccusative examples in (45) and (46), by contrast, the adjectival adverb now shows full agreement with the O(bject) in the former case and with the  $S_O$  subject in the latter case. The relevant agreement patterns can thus be readily framed in terms of a canonical active-stative alignment, inasmuch as there obtains a split between those participants ( $A$ ,  $S_A$ ) which do not license adjectival adverb agreement and those ( $O$ ,  $S_O$ ) which do.

As already noted in the literature (Rohlf 1977:135f.), Italo-Greek exhibits both non-inflecting deadjectival adverbs in *-a*, as in (47), and adjectival adverbs showing agreement as in (48):

- (47) E Maria kantali **kalà.** (Calimera, p.)  
 the.FSG.NOM Maria.FGS.NOM sing.PRS.3SG well  
 ‘Maria sings well.’
- (48) **Kalós/Kalí** irte! (Griko, Rohlf 1977:136)  
 good.MSG/FSG come.PFV.PST.2SG  
 ‘Welcome!’ (male/female addressee)

The data from written sources and our corpus reveal a similar picture for Griko. In particular, many of our speakers produced, alongside non-agreeing forms of the adjectival adverb, agreeing forms in conjunction with full DP objects (49a), including obligatory agreeing forms with clitic O(bjects) (49b) according to a pattern also found in southern Italo-Romance (cf. Ledgeway 2011a; 2017), as well as with unaccusative  $S_O$  subjects (50a-b) (cf. also 50c from Palumbo 1971). Crucially, though, none of our speakers accepted agreeing forms in conjunction with unergative  $S_A$  subjects (51a-b), which do not show agreement in written sources either (51c).

<sup>39</sup> In this and subsequent examples we indicate the agreement controller with underlining.

- (49) a. E                      Maria                      èpline                      us  
 the.FSG.NOM    Maria.FSG.NOM    clean.PFV.PST.3SG    the.MPL.ACC  
piattu                      **kalù** /                      es                      finestre  
 dishes.MPL.ACC    good.MPL.ACC    the.FPL.ACC    windows.FPL.NOM-ACC  
**kalè**. (Calimera, p.)  
 good.FPL.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Maria cleaned the dishes/windows well.’
- b. Isi                      Mmaria,                      ti                      peleghisane                      **kali** /  
 to.the    Maria.FSG.ACC    her.FSG.ACC=    beat.PST.PFV.3PL    good.FSG.ACC-NOM  
**\*kalà**. (Corigliano, s-s.)  
 well  
 ‘As for Maria, they gave her a good hiding.’
- (50) a. E                      mana                      palea                      i                      Mmaria  
 the.FSG.NOM    mother.FSG.NOM    old.FSG.NOM-ACC    the.FSG.GEN    Maria.FSG.GEN  
en                      estè                      **kali**. (Calimera, p.)  
 NEG=    stay.PRS.3SG    good.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Maria’s grandmother is not feeling well.’
- b. O                      pappo                      i                      Mmaria                      en  
 the.MSG.NOM    grandfather.MSG.NOM    the.FSG.GEN    Maria.FSG.GEN    NEG=  
estei                      **kalò**. (Calimera, p.)  
 stay.PRS.3SG    good.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Maria’s grandfather is not feeling well.’
- c. puru                      nârti                      **kali**                      e  
 so.that    IRR.PRT=come.SBJV.3SG    good.FSG.NOM-ACC    the.FSG.NOM  
fera. (Palumbo 1971:146)  
 fair.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘so that the fair goes well.’
- (51) a. O                      Pietro                      e                      kkantali                      **kalà** /  
 the.MSG.NOM    Pietro.MSG.NOM    NEG=    sing.PRS.3SG    well  
**\*kalò**. (Calimera, p.)  
 good.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Pietro doesn’t sing well.’
- b. E                      Maria                      kantali                      **kalà** /  
 the.FSG.NOM    Maria.FSG.NOM    sing.PRS.3SG    well  
**\*kali**. (Calimera, p.)  
 good.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Maria sings well.’

- c. arte      nòisa                      **kalà** (Palumbo 1971:195)  
 now    understand.PRS.1SG    well  
 ‘now I understand well’

This same active-stative distribution of adjectival adverb agreement is also in evidence in Greko, witness the following representative examples taken from both our fieldwork and written sources.

- (52) a. Ekho              na              katharizzo              **kalò**  
 have.PRS.1SG    IRR.PRT    clean.PRS.1SG    good.NSG-MSG.NOM-ACC

to                      spiti. (Gallicianò, s-s.)  
 the.NSG.NOM-ACC    house.NSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘I have to clean the house properly.’

- b. Dóppu    pu    ton              efórese              **máño**              ée  
 after      that    him.ACC=    dress.PFV.PST.3SG    pretty.MSG.NOM-ACC    and

**pulító**. (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:25)  
 appropriate.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘After she had dressed him well and appropriately.’

- c. An    den    do              stiréspo              **kaló** (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi &  
 if      NEG=    it.NSG=    iron.PRS.1SG    good.NSG

Caracausi 1959:49)  
 ‘If I don’t iron it [the item of clothing] well’

- d. Sa              ddonno              ée    túndo    leunáci              ée    kratitéto  
 you.GEN=    give.PRS.1SG    and    this.NSG    lion.NSG    and    keep=it.NSG

**kalá!** (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:102)  
 well  
 ‘I’ll also give you this little lion, and take good care of it!’

- e. Ma    esù    diplóeto                      **kalá!**  
 but      you    wrap.IMP=him.MSG.ACC    well

(Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:105)  
 ‘But wrap him [= your son] up well!’

- (53) a. I                      Maria                      den    epplèneto  
 the.FSG.NOM    Maria.FSG.NOM    NEG=    wash.NON-ACT.IPVF.PST.3SG

mai      **kalì**. (Chorìo di Roghudi, p.)  
 never    good.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Maria never washed herself properly.’

- b. Petro                      en    epplèneto                      mai  
 Pietro.MSG.NOM-ACC    NEG=    wash.NON-ACT.IPVF.PST.3SG    never

**kalò.** (Chorio di Roghudi, same speaker)  
 good.MSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Pietro never washed himself properly.’

- c. Íto                      **kali**                      jatremméni. (Bova, Rohlfs 1977:136)  
 come.PFV.PST.3SG    good.FSG.NOM-ACC    cure.NON-FIN  
 ‘She arrived greatly cured.’

- (54) a. O                      Petro                      tragudassi              **kalà.** (Chorio di Roghudi, p.)  
 the.MSG.NOM    Pietro.MSG.NOM    sing.PRS.3SG    well  
 ‘Pietro sings well.’

- b. Ciola    e                      Maria                      tragudassi              **kalà** /  
 also    the.FSG.NOM    Maria.FSG.NOM    sing.PRS.3SG    well

\***kali.** (Chorio di Roghudi, same speaker)  
 good.FSG.NOM-ACC  
 ‘Maria too sings well.’

- c. Ma    e                      fforéggo              **kalá.** (Bova, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:409f.)  
 but    NEG=    dance.PRS.1SG    well  
 ‘But I don’t dance well.’ (subject = feminine singular)

The examples in (52)-(53) show agreement of the adjectival adverb which is variously controlled either by an O(bject) (cf. 52a-c) or by an S<sub>O</sub> unaccusative subject (cf. 53). However, once again we observe that such agreement is optional, witness the use of the non-agreeing adverbial form *kalá* in (52d-e), and indeed impossible with unergative S<sub>A</sub> subjects (54).

In summary, the evidence reviewed in this section reveals an additional reflex of an emerging, though not yet fully stabilized, active-stative alignment in the distribution of adjectival adverb agreement which proves sensitive to the A/S<sub>A</sub> vs O/S<sub>O</sub> split.

### 6.3 Sentential word order

One final piece of evidence in favour of an ongoing shift towards an active-stative alignment comes from sentential word order. With the exception of some modern Gallo-Romance varieties, Romance languages have broadly converged towards an unmarked SVO word order. However, this SVO order masks in most modern varieties an active-stative alignment where S and O are to be understood more broadly as A/S<sub>A</sub> and O/S<sub>O</sub>, respectively (cf. Bentley 2006:364-368; Ledgeway 2012:334f.). This explains why in the unmarked case (answering the question: *What happened?*) transitive (55a) and unergative (55b) subjects occur preverbally, whereas unaccusative subjects (55c) occur in a postverbal position corresponding to that occupied by the complement in transitive constructions (cf. *la finestra* in 55a):

- (55) a. **Marco**    ha                      rotto                      (#Marco)    la  
 Marco    have.PRS.IND.3SG    break.PFV.PTCP              the  
  
 finestra    (#Marco). (Italian)  
 window  
 ‘Marco has broken the window.’

- b. **Maria**    ha                      cantato                      (#Maria). (Italian)  
 Maria    have.PRS.IND.3SG    sing.PFV.PTCP

‘Maria has been singing.’

- c. (#**Gianni**) è arrivato **Gianni**. (Italian)  
 Gianni be.PRS.IND.3SG arrived.PFV.PTCP Gianni  
 ‘Gianni has arrived.’

Now, in contrast to Standard Modern Greek where sentential word order is notoriously very liberal (Philippaki-Warbuton 1985; Mackridge 1987:234-239; Tsimpli 1990; Horrocks 1994; Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 2004:229-232; Roussou & Tsimpli 2004; Anagnostopoulou 2013:13, 20-22), the word order of Italo-Greek is considerably more constrained, excluding, for example, VSO orders in root clauses. Rather, on a par with what has just been seen for Italian in (55), the neutral word order of Griko follows an unmistakable active-stative split. Consequently, transitive (56a) and unergative (56b) subjects occur in preverbal position in the unmarked case, whereas unaccusative subjects (57a) occur in postverbal position on a par with transitive objects (57b).

- (56) a. **E** **Maria** mas fònase na  
 the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM us.ACC= call.PFV.PST.3SG IRR.PRT  
 fame nomeni. (Calimera, p.)  
 eat.SBJV.1PL together  
 ‘Maria called us to go and eat together.’
- b. **O** **Pietro** e kkantali kalà. (Calimera, p.)  
 the.MSG.NOM Pietro.MSG.NOM NEG= sing.PRS.3SG well  
 ‘Pietro doesn’t sing well.’
- (57) a. Pèsane **o** **sciddho** **mu**. (Calimera, p.)  
 die.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM dog.MSG.NOM =my  
 ‘My dog died.’
- b. Ida **diu** **sciddhu** **mavru**. (Calimera, p.)  
 see.PFV.PST.1SG two dogs.MPL.ACC black.MPL.ACC  
 ‘I saw two black dogs.’

An identical active-stative distribution is found in Greko (M.-O. Squillaci p.c.), as the following examples of rhematic clauses clearly demonstrate: both transitive (58a) and unergative (58b) subjects (A/S<sub>A</sub>) occur preverbally, whereas unaccusative subjects (S<sub>O</sub>) occur in the immediate postverbal position (59a) on par with transitive O(bjects) (59b).

- (58) a. Mian iméra **o** **éuristi** éspase  
 one.ACC day the.MSG.NOM father.MSG.NOM=her kill.PFV.PST.3SG  
 énam buddí. (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:36)  
 a.NSG bird.NSG  
 ‘One day her father killed a bird.’
- b. **Tút’ i** **dio** ediskurréai.  
 these the.MPL.NOM two.M-F.NOM chat.IPFV.PST.3PL  
 (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:78)  
 ‘These two were chatting.’

- (59) a. *Će exádi i alapúða.*  
and disappear.PFV.PST.3SG the.FSG.NOM fox.FSG.NOM-ACC

(Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:27)  
'And the fox disappeared.'

- b. *O Francéscoe ékame to*  
the.MSG.NOM Francesco.MSG.NOM-ACC make.PFV.PST.3SG the.NSG  
*síño tu ayu stavrú.*  
sign.NSG the.NSG.GEN holy.NSG.GEN cross.NSG.GEN

(Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:44)  
'Francesco made the sign of the holy cross.'

Once again, evidence from word order points to an active-stative orientation at the level of the sentence to parallel the identical alignment pattern examined above for adjectival adverbs, as well as those in the verbal domain (auxiliary selection) and nominal domain (restricted nominative for A/S<sub>A</sub> and extended accusative for O/S<sub>O</sub>).

## 7 Conclusion

Above we have reviewed considerable evidence from the nominal, verbal and sentential domains of Griko and Greko which highlight an ongoing shift from an original nominative-accusative alignment towards an active-stative alignment. In the nominal domain we have seen how this alignment shift results in a redistribution of nominative and accusative case-marking according to underlying semantic roles, rather than surface syntactic relations. Accordingly, active subjects (A/S<sub>A</sub>) of transitives and unergatives are case-marked nominative, whereas stative subjects (S<sub>O</sub>) of unaccusatives are increasingly marked accusative on a par with canonical O(bjects).<sup>40</sup> In this way,

<sup>40</sup> It is also striking that, in contrast to Griko, all examples of accusative subjects in Greko noted in Rossi Taibbi and Caracausi (1959), as well as those in Katsoyannou (1999) and in our corpus (with the exceptions of the relative example in (26b), the coordination example in (32b), and the example with copula BE in 34), occur in the typical postverbal O(bject) position; whenever inactive subjects (S<sub>O</sub>) occur in preverbal position, the unmarked position of active subjects (A/S<sub>A</sub>), they invariably surface in the nominative. Particularly revealing in this respect is the minimal pair reported by Katsoyannou (1999:242) in (i.a-b) produced by the same speaker, where the pre- and postverbal positions correlate with nominative and accusative case-marking, respectively (we assume, despite appearances, that the meteorological predicate *'ekamen (tin) kia'ria* is not a true transitive verb, but a compound unaccusative with cognate surface object and a stative (viz. S<sub>O</sub>) subject *xri'sto*):

- (i) a. *o xri'sto 'ekamen kia'ria.* (Gallicianò)  
the.MSG.NOM christ.MSG.NOM-ACC do.PFV.PST.3SG fine.weather.FSG.NOM-ACC  
b. *'ekamen to xri'sto tin kia'ria.* (Gallicianò)  
do.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC christ.MSG.NOM-ACC the.FSG.ACC fine.weather.FSG.NOM-ACC  
'The weather was fine.'

We leave it to future work to establish to what extent accusative-marking of inactive subjects, at least in Greko, is also structurally tied to their surface position. If our interpretation of the facts is correct, then this would suggest that Greko represents a more conservative variety than Griko, inasmuch as accusative-marking has not yet been (fully) extended to the preverbal position as in Griko. Presumably, this tendency also explains the sole example in our Greko written corpus of the otherwise exceptional accusative-marking of a transitive subject (cf. ii) ostensibly determined by its postverbal

the Italo-Greek nominal system comes to mirror the formal split already visible in the verb system where, on a par with Standard Modern Greek (cf. §3), the morphological paradigms of the active and non-active (viz. medio-passive) largely correlate with the distribution of A/S<sub>A</sub> and S<sub>O</sub> subjects, respectively, as schematized in Table 4 for the present and past imperfective of *plen-* ‘wash’ (cf. Rohlfs 1977:110-113, 199f.):

Table 4. Correlations between active and non-active morphology and case-marking

A/S <sub>A</sub> [+Nom]		<----->S <sub>O</sub> [+Nom/Acc]	
Active		Non-active	
Present Imperfective			
Griko	Greko	Griko	Greko
plen-o	plen-o	plèn-ome	plèn-ome
plen-i(s)	plen-i(s)	plèn-ese(s)	plèn-ese
plen-i	plen-i	plèn-ete	plèn-ete
plèn-ome	plèn-ome	plen-ò mesta	plen-ò mesta
plèn-ete	plèn-ite	plen-è sesta	plèn-este
plènune	plèn-usi	plèn-utte	plèn-onde
Past Imperfective			
èplen-a	èplen-a	plèn-amo	eplèn-ommo
èplen-e(s)	èplen-e(s)	plèn-aso	eplèn-esso
èplen-e	èplen-e	plèn-ato	eplèn-eto
plèn-amo	eplèn-ame	plen-à mosto	eplen-ò mesta
plèn-ato	eplèn-ete	plen-àsosto	eplèn-este
plèn-ane	eplèn-asi	plèn-atto	eplèn-ondo

It is thus legitimate to ask why in other varieties of Greek such as Standard Modern Greek a similar active-stative alignment has not arisen in the nominal case system. One possible answer would be to invoke endogenous factors present in Italo-Greek, but not in other varieties of Greek. This is essentially the line taken by Katsoyannou (1999:239f.) in her analysis of accusative subjects in Greko, which she interprets as the surface effect of a case system in an irreparable state of collapse in a highly endangered language which is rapidly being abandoned by a bilingual community with greater native competence in a Romance variety without a case system. Yet, Katsoyannou’s view represents a misconception of the Italo-Greek case system which, despite some apparent superficial neutralizations (cf. Table 2), still constitutes a robust system with a high functional load, consistently with Dimmendaal’s (1998:87) claim based on Dorian’s (1978:608) original observation that ‘an obsolescent language often dies “with its morphological boots on”’ (on the reduction of the morphological structure of the case system in Italo-Greek, see also Guardiano & Stavrou 2019). This is clearly demonstrated by the representative Italo-Greek nominal paradigms with accompanying definite article in Table 5 (based on Rohlfs 1977:66f.).<sup>41</sup>

Table 5. Italo-Greek definite nominal paradigms

	Greko	Griko
	Masculine ( <i>lik-</i> ‘wolf’, <i>min-</i> ‘month’)	

position (but note also the reduced transitivity of the clause given the non-dynamic, habitual interpretation of the predicate):

- (ii)      ti      ylitʃia      'kannusi      te      yi'neke? (Gallicianò, Katsoyannou 1999:242)  
           what   cakes.NPL   make.PRS.3PL   the.FPL.ACC   women.FPL.NOM-ACC  
           ‘What type of cakes do the women make?’

<sup>41</sup> For further detailed description of the morphological case system of Italo-Greek nouns, see Rohlfs (1977:69-82) and Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri (in prep.:ch. 2).

	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl
Nom	o liko	i liki	o mina	i mini	o liko	i/e liki	o mina	i/e mini
Acc	to lliko	tu lliku	to mmina	tu mminu	(t)o lliko	(t)u lliku	(t)o mmina	(t)u mminu
Gen	tu liku	to lliko	tu minu/-a	to mmino	(t)u liku	(t)o lliko	(t)u minu/-a	(t)o mminò/ mmino
<b>Feminine (<i>alé-</i> ‘olive’, <i>man-</i> ‘mother’)</b>								
	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl
Nom	i alèa	i alè	i mana	i mane	e alèa	i alè	i mana	i mane
Acc	tin alèa	tes alè	tim mana	te mmane	(t)in alèa	(t)es alè	(t)i mmana	(t)es mane/ (t)e mmane
Gen	tis alèa	tos alèò	ti mmanò	to mmanò/ mmano	(t)is alèa	(t)os alèò	(t)is mana/ (t)i mmana	(t)os manò/mano/ (t)o mmanò/mmano
<b>Neuter (<i>krea(-)</i> ‘meat’, <i>pe δ-</i> ‘child’)</b>								
	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl
Nom	to krea	ta krèata	to peði	ta peði	(t)o krea	(t)a krèata	(t)o peði	(t)a peðia
Acc								
Gen	tu kreatu	to kkrèato	tu peðiù	tos peðiò	(t)u kreatu	(t)os krèato/ (t)o kkrèatu	(t)u peðiù	(t)u peðiò

However, it is true that nominals introduced by the indefinite article do introduce some limited ambiguity into the system, as Table 6 illustrates (cf. Rohlfs 1977:68f.).

Table 6. Italo-Greek indefinite nominal paradigms

	Greko			Griko		
	M	F	N	M	F	N
Nom	(è)na(s) liko	m(i)a mana	((è)na(n) peði/) (è)na ppeði	((è)na(n) liko/) (è)na lliko	mia mana	((è)na(n) peði/) (è)na ppeði
Acc	((è)nan liko/) (è)na lliko	(m(i)an mana/) mia mmana		((è)nan liko/) (è)na lliko	(mian mana/) mia mmana	
Gen	enù liku	(mias manò/) mia mmanò	(è)nù peðiò	anù liku	(anis mana/) anì mmana	anù peðiù

In particular, we see that in masculine and neuter nouns the core distinction between nominative and accusative is neutralized. With neuter forms this is unsurprising in that nominative and accusative are syncretic in the neuter in other Greek varieties too (and in Indo-European more generally; cf. also Table 5), but this has never led to a generalization of accusative-marking of subjects in these varieties. However, the neutralization witnessed in masculine indefinites in Griko where, for example, underlying nominative and accusative forms such as *èna(n) liko* and *ènan liko* can both surface indiscriminately as *èna lliko*, could *a priori* be argued to provide the original impetus for a progressive, but still optional, extension of accusative-marking to the subject relation.<sup>42</sup> Tempting though this superficial morphophonological explanation might appear (cf. also footnote 27), it must be immediately dismissed since it incorrectly predicts an indiscriminate extension of accusative-marking to all surface subjects. Yet, we have seen that accusative-marking of subjects is specifically

<sup>42</sup> Prevocalic contexts where, for apparently euphonic reasons, non-etymological *-n* surfaces most robustly on the nominative indefinite article (i.a), including in Greko (i.b; cf. Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:LVIII), also give rise to (apparent) cases of surface neutralization of nominative and accusative in masculine (and of course neuter) noun phrases (cf. Rohlfs 1977:69).

- (i) a Irte                      an                      ántrepo. (Griko)  
       b Irte                      nan                      áθropo. (Greko)  
              come.PFV.PST.3SG    a.(NOM-)ACC    man.NOM-ACC  
              ‘A man came.’

Observe, however, that Rohlfs’ examples in (i.a-b) crucially involve postverbal subjects of unaccusative predicates.



limited to stative subjects (So), incontrovertibly showing that what lays behind the extension of the accusative is of a structural nature replicating a distribution independently observed in early Indo-European.

Instead, we argue that the emergence of accusative subjects in Italo-Greek is due to exogenous factors and, in particular, to language contact with Romance. This immediately explains why the extended accusative is only found in those Greek varieties that have been in contact with Romance, but not, for example, in Standard Modern Greek. Moreover, although Griko and Greko are not, and never have been, in contact with one another (Profili 1983; Katsoyannou 1995; Manolesou 2005; Squillaci 2017:2), they have both independently developed the extended accusative precisely because they have both individually been in intense contact for centuries with Romance varieties where the evidence for an active-stative alignment is robustly attested in various areas of the grammar (for an overview, see Ledgeway 2012:ch. 7). As a consequence, the speakers of Italo-Greek are also native speakers of local Romance varieties, and in most cases more natively competent in Romance than Greek, such that after many centuries of Greek influencing local Romance varieties, a case of so-called *spirito greco, materia romanza* ‘Greek spirit, Romance material’ (cf. Ledgeway 2006; Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri in press), their local Greek varieties today often display many Romance features, a case of *spirito romanzo, materia greca* ‘Romance spirit, Greek material’ (cf. Ledgeway 2013; Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri 2018b). It is therefore our contention that the emergence of the so-called extended accusative in Italo-Greek represents just one of several surface reflexes of an original Romance active-stative alignment which, in a process of partial replication, has progressively been extended and adapted in the native grammars of Italo-Greek speakers. It is for this reason that we have been at pains to show above that the extension of the accusative should not be considered an isolated phenomenon within the grammars of Italo-Greek, but must, rather, be interpreted as part of a larger gradual and ongoing shift towards an active-stative alignment which surfaces in various areas of the nominal, verbal and sentential domains.

Within this context, it is significant to note that, while the surface reflexes of this active-stative alignment observed in the verbal (auxiliary selection) and sentential (adjectival adverb agreement, subject placement) domains of Italo-Greek find an immediate structural parallel in Romance, ultimately the result of a process of PAT(tern) replication (Matras & Sakel 2007; cf. also Heine & Kuteva 2006), accusative-marking of stative subjects represents a Greek innovation since the relevant Romance contact varieties do not have a (nominal) case system. What we therefore see is an expansion of a Romance alignment PAT(tern) which, once embedded in the replicating Greek varieties through the increasing establishment of active-stative-driven auxiliary splits, adjectival adverb agreement and differential subject placement, is further reinforced by the extension of the alignment to new areas of the grammar using Greek MAT(erial) amenable to this same split. At the same time, we must not underestimate the complementary role of the Italo-Greek verb system where the inherited formal opposition between active and non-active verb forms (cf. Table 4) readily maps onto the semantico-syntactic distribution of nominative and accusative subjects, respectively, whilst further strengthening the emerging active-stative patterns in the auxiliary system, adjectival adverb agreement and subject placement.<sup>43</sup> We are therefore led to conclude that the role of contact-induced change in the emergence of accusative-marking of subjects is only indirect (cf. Willis 2017:§26.3): the motivation for the change clearly requires a language-internal, endogenous account in terms of spontaneous innovation (namely, expansion of active-stative syntax to the nominal domain), but the original catalyst for the introduction of the syntactic alignment PAT(ern) that it extends is the result of language-external, exogenous factors, namely contact with Romance.

In conclusion, our discussion of Italo-Greek and Romance alignments has shown how, at least on the surface, the grammars of these two linguistic groups are in many key respects converging, to the extent that the observed structural parallels are far too striking for them to be dismissed as accidental

<sup>43</sup> Relevant here is Guardiano et al.’s (2016) *Resistance Principle* according to which syntactic change under horizontal pressure only takes place if surface evidence that makes such a change structurally possible is already independently available in the language.

or the output of heavily attrited grammars. Rather, they must be considered the result of centuries-old intense structural contact between Greek and Romance, ultimately to be placed towards the upper end of the five-point scale of contact intensity proposed by Thomason & Kaufman (1988). Indeed, while it is well known that traditionally the direction of such contact has consistently involved the transfer and extension of original Greek structural features into the surrounding Romance varieties (cf. Ledgeway 2013), large-scale linguistic shifts among recent generations of the southern Italian Greek-speaking communities towards Romance have resulted in a reversal of the direction of contact. Consequently, today we see many examples of transfer of Romance structural features into Italo-Greek. In this respect, the ongoing emergence of an active-stative alignment in the syntax of the nominal, verbal and sentential domains of Italo-Greek represents a prime example of Romance-Greek contact and, in particular, highlights how the role of language contact may genuinely prove pervasive insofar as it is even able to trigger a shift in alignment, arguably involving a change of a macroparametric order (cf. Sheehan 2014).

## References

- Adams, James. 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alexiadou, Artemis & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2004. Voice morphology in the causative-inchoative alternation: evidence for a non-unified structural analysis of unaccusatives. *The Unaccusativity Puzzle: Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou & Martin Everaert, 114-136. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2013. Greek syntax 2012: State-of-the art and perspectives. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 33: 11-57.
- Aprile, Marcello, Rosario Coluccia, Franco Fanciullo & Riccardo Gualdo. 2002. La Puglia. In: *I dialetti italiani: storia, struttura e uso*, ed. by Manlio Cortelazzo, Carla Marcato, Nicola de Blasi & Gianrenzo Clivio, 679-756. Torino: UTET.
- Baldissera, Valeria. 2013. *Il dialetto Griko del Salento: elementi balcanici e contatto linguistico*. Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia, Doctoral thesis.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna. 2011. The rise of Dative Substitution in the history of Icelandic: A diachronic construction grammar account. *Lingua* 121(1): 60-79.
- Bastardas Parera, Juan. 1953. *Particularidades sintácticas del latín medieval*. Barcelona: Escuela de filología.
- Battisti, Carlo. 1927. Appunti sulla storia e sulla diffusione dell'ellenismo nell'Italia Meridionale (avec 3 cartes). *Revue de linguistique romaine* 3:1-97.
- Bentley, Delia. 2006. *Split Intransitivity in Italian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bentley, Delia. 2016. Split intransitivity. In: *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden, 821-832. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blake, Barry. 2004. *Case*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Cennamo, Michela. 2001a. On the reorganization of voice distinctions and grammatical relations in Late Latin. In: *De Lingua Latina novae quaestiones. Actes du X Colloque International de Linguistique Latine*, ed. by Claude Moussy, 51-65. Lowain-Paris: Peeters.
- Cennamo, Michela. 2001b. L'*extended accusative* e le nozioni di voce e relazione grammaticale nel latino tardo e medievale. In: *Ricerche Linguistiche fra Antico e Moderno*, ed. by Valeria Viparelli, 3-27. Napoli: Liguori.
- Cennamo, Michela. 2009. Argument structure and alignment variations and changes in Late Latin. In: *The Role of Semantic, Pragmatic, and Discourse Factors*, ed. by Jóhanna Barðdal & Shobhana Chelliah, 307-346. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Cennamo, Michela. 2011. Case marking of Core Arguments and Alignment in Late Latin. In: *Grammatical Case in the Languages of the Middle East and Europe. Acts of the International Colloquium Variations, Concurrence et Evolution des Cas dans divers Domaines Linguistiques. Paris, 2-4 April 2007*, ed. by Michèle Fruyt, Michel Mazoyer & Dennis Pardee, 297-314. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Comi, Pasquale. 1989. *Un'indagine sulla vitalità attuale del griko a Castrignano dei Greci (Lecce)*. University of Zurich BA thesis.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Danesi, Serena. 2014. Accusative Subjects in Avestan: 'Errors' or Non-Canonically Marked Arguments?. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 57: 223-260.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1900. *Vergleichende Syntax der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg: Trübner.
- Dimmendaal, Gerrit. 1998. Language contraction versus other types of contact-induced change. In: *Endangered Languages in Africa*, ed. by Matthias Brenzinger, 71-117. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Dixon, Robert. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorian, Nancy. 1978. The Fate of Morphological Complexity in Language Death: Evidence from East Sutherland Gaelic. *Language* 54: 590-609.
- Dorian, Nancy. 1980. Language Shift in Community and Individual: The phenomenon of the Laggard Semi-Speaker. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 25: 85-94.
- Dorian, Nancy. 1981. *Language death. The life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae. 2016. Case. In: *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden, 911-923. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Durante, Marcello. 1981. *Dal latino all'italiano moderno*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- Falcone, Giuseppe. 1973. *Il dialetto romaico della Bovesia*. Milan: Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardi di Scienze e Lettere.
- Fanciullo, Franco. 1996. *Fra oriente e occidente. Per una storia linguistica dell'Italia meridionale*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Fanciullo, Franco. 2001. On the Origins of Modern Greek in Southern Italy. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Mark Janse, Brian Joseph & Angela Ralli, 67-77. Patras: University of Patras.
- Fanciullo, Franco. 2007. Greco e grecismi nel diasistema italo-romanzo. Alcune considerazioni. In: *Nuove riflessioni sulla lessicografia. Presente, futuro e dintorni del Lessico etimologico italiano*, ed. by Marcello Aprile, 233-245. Galatina: Congedo.
- Friedman Victor & Brian Joseph. 2018. Non-nominative and depersonalized subjects in the Balkans: areality vs. genealogy. In: *Non-Canonically Case-Marked Subjects: The Reykjavík-Eyjafjallajökull Papers*, ed. by Jóhanna Barðdal, Na'ama Pat-El & Stephen Mark Carey, 23-53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Gemma Italia, Gemma & Georgia Lambroyorgu. 2001. *Grammatica del dialetto greco di Sternatia (Grecia salentina)*. Galatina: Congedo.
- Gerola, Berengario. 1949-50. Aspetti della sintassi del nominativo e dell'accusativo nel tardo latino. *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di SS.LL.AA* 108: 207-236.
- Guardiano, Cristina, Dimitris Michelioudakis, Andrea Ceolin, Monica Irimia, Giuseppe Longobardi, Nina Radkevic, Giuseppina Silvestri & Ioanna Sitaridou. 2016. South by south east. A syntactic approach to Greek and Romance microvariation. *L'Italia dialettale* LXXVII: 96-166.
- Guardiano, Cristina & Melita Stavrou. 2019. Adjective-Noun combinations in Romance and Greek of Southern Italy. Polydefiniteness revisited. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 19: 3-57.

- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2006. *The changing languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Helltula, Anne. 1987. *Studies on the Latin Accusative Absolute*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Herman, József. 1966. Recherches sur l'évolution grammaticale du latin vulgaire: Les emplois "fautifs" du nominatif. *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debrecen* 2: 109–12.
- Herman, József. 1987. La disparition de -s et la morphologie dialectale du latin parlé. In: *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif. Actes du Ier colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Pécs, 2–5 septembre 1985)*, ed. by József Herman, 97–108. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Herman, József. 1995. Les ardoises wisigothiques et le problème de la différenciation territoriale du latin. In: *Latin Vulgaire-Latin Tardif IV*, ed. by Louis Callebat, 63–76. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Holton, David, Peter Mackridge & Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 2004. *Greek. An Essential Grammar of the Modern Language*. London: Routledge.
- Holton, David, Peter Mackridge & Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 2012. *Greek. A Comprehensive Grammar*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition revised by Vassilios Spyropoulos. London: Routledge.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56(2): 251–299.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 1994. Subjects and configurationality: Modern Greek clause structure. *Journal of Linguistics* 30: 81–109.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 1997. *Greek. A history of the language and its speakers*. London: Longman.
- Katsoyannou, Marianne. 1999. Implications typologiques d'une évolution morphologique: le cas du sujet explicatif en gréco. *Revue d'ethnolinguistique* 8: 233–246.
- Kent, Roland. 1946. The accusative in Old Persian mām kāmā. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 66(1): 44–49.
- La Fauci, Nunzio. 1988. *Oggetti e soggetti nella formazione della morfosintassi romanza*. Pisa: Giardini.
- La Fauci, Nunzio. 1997. *Per una Teoria Grammaticale del Mutamento Morfosintattico. Dal Latino verso il Romanzo*. Pisa: ETS.
- Lazzeroni, Romano. 2002. Il nome greco del sogno e il neutro indoeuropeo. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 87(2):145–162.
- Lazzeroni, Romano. 2013. Fra ruoli semantici e ruoli pragmatici: il cosiddetto 'schema pindarico' nel greco antico. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 98: 26–40.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2006. The Dual Complementiser System in Southern Italy: *Spirito greco, materia romanza?*. In: *Rethinking Languages in Contact: The Case of Italian*, ed. by Anna Laura Lepschy & Arturo Tosi, 112–126. Oxford: Legenda.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2011a. Syntactic and Morphosyntactic Typology and Change. In: *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Volume 1: Structures*, ed. by Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith & Adam Ledgeway, 382–471. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2011b. Adverb agreement and split intransitivity: Evidence from Southern Italy. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 96: 31–66.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2013. Greek Disguised as Romance? The Case of Southern Italy. In: *Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Mark Janse, Brian Joseph, Angela Ralli & Metin Bağrıaçık, 184–228. Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2017. Patterns in Romance Adverb Agreement. In: *Adjective Adverb Interfaces in Romance*, ed. by Martin Hummel & Salvador Valera, 47–80. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2019. Parameters in the Development of Romance Perfective Auxiliary Selection. In: *Historical Linguistics 2015. Selected Papers from the 22<sup>nd</sup> International*

- Conference on Historical Linguistics, Naples, 27-31 July 2015*, ed. by Michela Cennamo & Claudia Fabrizio, 344-384. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2018a. The expression of progressive aspect in Griko: mapping morphosyntactic isoglosses in an endangered Italo-Greek variety. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 116(2): 1-39.
- Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2018b. Il contatto tra il greco e le varietà romanze nella Calabria meridionale. *Lingue Antiche e Moderne* 75: 95-133.
- Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2018c. Accusative subjects in Italo-Greek: alignment vs ECM. Talk given at *CamCoS 7*, 10-12 May 2018, University of Cambridge.
- Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. In press. The Negative Imperative in Southern Calabria. *Spirito greco, materia romanza* again? *Journal of Language Contact*.
- Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. In prep. *The Fading Voices of Southern Italy: A Case Study in Greek-Romance Language Contact in Magna Graecia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2016. L'accordo degli avverbi aggettivali e del participio passato nei dialetti meridionali. In: *Atti del IV Convegno internazionale di dialettologia - Progetto A.L.Ba*, ed. by Patrizia Del Puente, 163-185. Venosa: Osanna Edizioni.
- Löfstedt, Einar. 1933. *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins. Zweiter Teil: Syntaktisch-Stilistische Gesichtspunkte und Probleme*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 2007. On Triple auxiliation. *Linguistics* 45: 173-222.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 2016. Auxiliary selection and participle agreement. In: *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden, 802-818. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mackridge, Peter. 1987. *The Modern Greek Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Manolessou, Io. 2005a. The Greek dialects of Southern Italy: an overview. *Kambos: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 13: 103-125.
- Manolessou, Io. 2005b. From participles to gerunds. In: *Advances in Greek Generative Syntax*, ed. by Melita Stavrou & Arhonto Terzi, 241-283. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Marra, Piersaverio. 2008. Un'indagine sociolinguistica nella Grecia Salentina: 'Speculazioni' su una lingua in agonia. In: *Il griko nel terzo millennio: 'Speculazioni' su una lingua in agonia*, ed. by Antonio Romano & Piersaverio Marra, 49-100. Lecce: Il Laboratorio.
- Martino, Paolo. 1980. L'isola grecanica nell'Aspromonte. Aspetti sociolinguistici. In: *I dialetti e le lingue delle minoranze di fronte all'italiano. Atti dell'XI congresso internazionale di studi. Cagliari 27-30 maggio 1977*, ed. by Federico Albano Leoni, 305-41. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Investigating the Mechanisms of Pattern Replication in Language Convergence. *Studies in Language* 31: 829-865.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. On the Distribution of Active and Ergative Patterns. *Lingua* 45: 233-279.
- Morosi, Giuseppe. 1870. *Studi sui dialetti greci della Terra d'Otranto: preceduto da una raccolta di canti, leggende, proverbi e indovinelli nei dialetti medesimi*. Lecce: Tip. Editrice Salentina.
- Norberg, Dag. 1944. *Beiträge zur Spätlateinischen Syntax*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Palumbo, Vito D. 1971. *Roda ce kattia (Rose e spine)*. Con introduzione, trascrizione fonetica, traduzione e note di Paolo Stomeo. Lecce: Centro di studi salentini.
- Parlangeli, Oronzo. 1953. *Sui dialetti romanzi e romaici del Salento*. Milan: Hoepli.
- Pellegrini, Manuela. 2016. Performing Griko beyond 'death'. *Palaver* 5(1): 137-162.
- Pensado, Carmen. 1986. Inversion de marcase et perte du système casuel en ancien français. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 102: 271-296.
- Perlmutter, David. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4: 157-189.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, Irene. 1985. Word-order in Modern Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 83(1), 113-143.

- Pieroni, Silvia. 1999. Non-promotional objects in Late Latin. *Verbum* 21: 117–29.
- Plank, Frans. 1985. The Extended Accusative/Restricted Nominative in Perspective. In: *Relational Typology*, ed. by Frans Plank, 269–310. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Profili, Olga. 1983. *Le parler grico de Corigliano d'Otranto (province de Lecce, Italie): phénomènes d'interférence entre ce parler grec et les parlers romans environnants, ainsi qu'avec l'italien*. University of Grenoble: doctoral thesis.
- Ralli, Angela. 2006. Syntactic and morphosyntactic phenomena in modern Greek dialects. The state of the art. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 7: 121–159.
- Ralli, Angela. In press. Greek in Contact with Romance. In: *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Romance Languages*, ed. by Francesco Gardani & Michele Loporcaro. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Remberger, Eva-Maria. 2011. Morfosintassi verbale dei dialetti neogreci in Calabria. In: *L'influsso dell'italiano sul sistema del verbo delle lingue minoritarie. Resistenza e mutamento nella morfologia e nella sintassi*, ed. by Walter Breu, 123–148. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.
- Remberger, Eva-Maria. 2018. Greek in southern Italy: morphosyntactic isomorphism and a possible exception. In: *Balkan and South Slavic Enclaves in Italy: Languages, Dialects and Identities*, ed. by Thede Kahl, Iliana Krapova & Giuseppina Turano, 135–152. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1924. *Griechen und Romanen in Unteritalien*. Geneva: Olschki.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1933. *Das Fortleben des antiken Griechentums in Unteritalien*. Cologne: Petracca Haus.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1974. *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Grecia*. Galatina: Congedo.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1977. *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci*. Monaco: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Romano, Antonio. 2008. Riflessioni preliminari sulla situazione linguistica della Grecia Salentina. In: *Il griko nel terzo millennio: 'Speculazioni' su una lingua in agonia*, ed. by Antonio Romano & Piersaverio Marra. Lecce: Il Laboratorio, 13–47.
- Rossi Taibbi, Giuseppe & Girolamo Caracausi. 1959. *Testi neogreci di Calabria. Parte I: Introduzione, prolegomeni e testi di Roccaforte a cura di Giuseppe Rossi Taibbi. Parte II: Testi di Rochudi, di Condofuri, Di Bova e indici a cura di Girolamo Caracausi*. Palermo: Istituto siciliano di studi bizantini e neoellenici.
- Roussou, Anna & Ianthi-Maria Tsimpli. 2004. The derivation of VSO in Greek and its implications for word order variation. *Proceedings of the UCL Alumni Reunion Conference*, 19–23. UCL: Department of Linguistics.
- Rovai, Francesco. 2005. L'estensione dell'accusativo in latino tardo e medievale. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 90(1): 54–89.
- Rovai, Francesco. 2007. Manifestazioni di sub-sistemi tipologici attivi in latino. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 92(1): 51–64.
- Rovai, Francesco. 2012. Between feminine singular and neuter plural: re-analysis patterns. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 110(1): 94–121.
- Rovai, Francesco. 2014. Case marking in absolute constructions: further evidence for a semantically based alignment in Late Latin. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13(1): 115–143.
- Schifano, Norma & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2017. Nuove indagini linguistiche sulla varietà greca del Salento. *L'Italia dialettale* LXXVIII: 279–312.
- Schifano, Norma, Giuseppina Silvestri & Maria Olimpia Squillaci. 2016. Some preliminary observations on auxiliary selection and participle agreement in Greko and Bovesè. In: *Proceedings of the 6th Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, University of Patras, 25–28 September 2014*, ed. by Angela Ralli, Nikos Koutsoukos & Stavros Bompolas, 166–177. Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras.

- Sheehan, Michelle. 2014. Towards a parameter hierarchy for alignment. In: *Proceedings of WCCFL 31*, ed. by Robert E. Santana-LaBarge, 399-408. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity. In: *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, ed. by Robert Dixon, 112-171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. Republished in: *Features and Projections*, ed. by Peter Muysken & Henk van Riemsdijk (1986), 163-232. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Sobrero, Alberto. 1980. Conservazione e trasformazione nella storia più recente del griko salentino. In: *I dialetti e le lingue delle minoranze di fronte all'italiano, Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di studi della SLI* (Cagliari, 27-30 maggio 1977), ed. by Federico Albano Leoni, 389-401. Bulzoni: Roma.
- Sobrero, Alberto & Annarita Miglietta. 2005. Politica linguistica e presenza del Griko in Salento, oggi. In: *Lingue, istituzioni, territori. Riflessioni teoriche, proposte metodologiche ed esperienze di politica linguistica*, ed. by Cristina Guardiano, Emilia Claresu, Cecilia Robustelli & Augusto Carli, 209-226. Roma, Bulzoni.
- Sorace, Antonella. 2000. Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76: 859-890.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 2011. Romance Linguistics and Historical Linguistics: Reflections on Synchrony and Diachrony'. In: *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Vol 1: Structures*, ed. by Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith & Adam Ledgeway, 1-49. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Spano, Benito. 1965. *La grecità bizantina e i suoi riflessi geografici nell'Italia meridionale e insulare*. Pisa: Goliardica.
- Spencer, Andrew. 2009. Case as a morphological phenomenon. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, ed. by Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer, 185-199. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Squillaci, Maria Olimpia. 2017. *When Greek Meets Romance. A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Language Contact in Aspromonte*. University of Cambridge doctoral thesis.
- Stamuli, Maria Francesca. 2007. *Morte di lingua e variazione lessicale nel greco. Tre profili dalla Bovesia*. University of Naples doctoral thesis.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tommasi, Salvatore. 2001. *Katalisti o Kosmo. Tra passato e presente. Lingua, tradizione e folklore nella Grecia Salentina. Materiali per un seminario sul griko 1995-1996*. Galatina: Editrice Salentina.
- Tsimpli, Ianthi Maria. 1990. The clause structure and word order of Modern Greek. *UCL working papers in Linguistics* 2: 226-255.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1982. *Introduzione al latino volgare*. Bologna: Pàtron.
- Vincent, Nigel. 1982. The Development of the Auxiliaries *habere* and *esse* in Romance. In: *Studies in the Romance Verb*, ed. by Nigel Vincent & Martin Harris, 71-96. London: Croom Helm.
- Westerbergh, Ulla. 1956. *Chronicon Salernitanum: A Critical Edition with Studies on Literary and Historical Sources and on Language*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Willis, David. 2017. Endogenous and exogenous theories of language change. In: *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway & Ian Roberts, 491-514. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zamboni, Alberto. 1998. Dal latino tardo al romanzo arcaico: Aspetti diacronico-tipologici della flessione nominale. In: *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX congresso internazionale della Società di linguistica italiana, Pavia, 26-28 settembre 1996*, ed. by Paolo Ramat & Elisa Roma, 127-46. Rome: Bulzoni.

